

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

---

Volume XXXIV

JULY 1939

---

Number 3

## DRAMATIC INFANTS IN GREEK

L. A. POST

**M**Y PURPOSE in this paper is to point out that a baby may be principal rather than accessory in the plot of a Greek play and that, since the distinction between *matrimonium* and *concubinatus* may depend, as the Latin words imply, on the recognition of offspring by a father, the baby may be a necessary and moral factor in the marriage of two lovers. Ultimately I hope to throw new light on Menander's dramatic affinities and on the place of women in Greek life, but my passing references to these subjects are not the main theme of my article and will, I hope, receive more elaborate treatment later.

Except for Menander, an account of infants in Greek drama might be almost as brief as the celebrated chapter on the snakes of Iceland: "There are no snakes in Iceland." Infants appear rarely in tragedy and epic. In the *Trojan Women* of Euripides, Astyanax by his fate makes a direct appeal to the pity of the spectators, and, as a symbol of the Trojan hope of a renaissance and as a pledge of his mother's memory of Hector, he represents in his death the final blackness of despair that leaves no single gleam of hope, no vestige of past fortune for the desolate to cherish. In the *Iphigenia at Aulis*, the infant Orestes is an accessory to his sister's plea for life. She adds to hers his mute appeal to Agamemnon not to slay a daughter.<sup>1</sup> The dramatic moment becomes more intense as Agamemnon's decision is made

<sup>1</sup> Ll. 1241-48.

harder, but the infant's fate is not at stake, and he remains rather an instrument than a principal of the drama. So in the *Telephus*, Orestes was simply an instrument, used at a melodramatic moment to make his father yield.<sup>2</sup> The drama is concerned with him only briefly and for his influence on others. Similarly Telemachus was used as a pawn by Palamedes to force Odysseus to give up his pretense of madness and go to war. In Sophocles' *Ajax*, the infant Eurysaces, who is a pledge of union between the boy's mother and Ajax, lends strength to her appeal to pity, gives dramatic intensity to the decision of Ajax, and later symbolizes by his presence his dead father's claim to honor after death.<sup>3</sup>

In Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* the child Orestes' absence is symbolic of the drawn sword between husband and wife. Clytemnestra feels it as an accusation and apologizes for it as she does for her own dearth of tears.<sup>4</sup> In Homer the babe Astyanax is both symbol and victim. The death of Hector, terrible in itself, is tempered with pity for his wife and child. The death of an armed man has much of grandeur to restrain our tears; the wife's frustrated affection and the blighted future of the son are stuff of unmixed pathos. As symbol the babe is an essential element of wedded love. Homer, with characteristic Greek morality, defines wedlock and profane love by sharp contrasting pictures. In *Iliad* iii Paris leaves the battlefield dishonored but unashamed to seek pleasure in the arms of Helen. She for her part scorns him as she yields to what she knows is shame and hatefulness. The love of Helen and Paris is a tormenting itch that can have no satisfaction and no charm. Helen has left her family; her life and happiness have no root in nature and must wither. By contrast Hector visits the city in *Iliad* vi in line of duty. He will not stop to take refreshment. He will not stay from battle though his wife pleads. His love is rooted in honor, not pleasure, and is stronger than death. Astyanax is a bond and a symbol; his father's honor will grow and increase with the boy's growth; and so will his mother's pride and happiness. Both parents know the joy of creative surrender to the future. Homer's family is a moral triangle firm-based to meet all shocks. So strong a bond of

<sup>2</sup> See Aristophanes *Ach.* 331 f. for a parody of the scene in which Telephus gains a hearing by holding the infant Orestes as a hostage.

<sup>3</sup> Ll. 510-13 and 1168-81.

<sup>4</sup> Ll. 877 f.

wedded love were children to the Greeks that Medea, in Euripides' play, when her husband failed her, cut off her children too, as if they were but symbols, made meaningless by his defection. So Agamemnon, when he slew his daughter, thereby divorced his wife's love and poisoned her thoughts of him.<sup>5</sup>

Thus the babe appears in tragedy and epic as instrument in the dramatic plot, as symbol of wedded love, as pledge of loyalty to a dead person or a fallen nation, and as a powerful ingredient of pity. As-tyanax, whether in the *Iliad* or in the *Trojan Women*, plays a part very near the center of the story. Even so, however, he is prominent only in one or two scenes, and his fortunes are not the main thread of the plot.

In Menander infants become prominent to an extent unparalleled in other fiction. Of the three plays of which we have considerable parts preserved, two, *Samia* and *Epitrepontes*, have each a baby, and in each the baby appears more than once on the stage. On the modern stage babies, as a rule, are neither seen nor heard, so that an effort of adjustment is necessary if we are to understand Menander. The modern critic tends to assume that the presence of babies is not an essential in Menander and that "the diabolical ingenuity that distinguishes Menander's babies," to quote Gilbert Murray (*Aristophanes* [Oxford, 1933], p. 253) is a rather bizarre element in the plays. It seems therefore worth while to put the question whether the babies are not really of much more importance than has been supposed, and whether an understanding of their dramatic function may not lead to an enhanced appreciation of Menander's interpretation of life.

In English literature babies born or begotten out of wedlock normally preclude a happy ending. It is natural that the modern reader should be shocked to find that in Menander such irregularities lead to happiness in the end. Apparently, vice is rewarded, and the effect is immoral. Since Plutarch held that Menander had a good moral influence, since his plays were in fact read in schools, there is a contradiction that demands explanation.<sup>6</sup> The dramatic function of the two

<sup>5</sup> *Agamemnon* 151-55.

<sup>6</sup> Plutarch *Quaest. conv.* vii. 8 (712b-d); Ovid *Tristia* ii. l. 370: "Et solet hic pueris virginibusque legi." I have translated the passage of Plutarch in *TAPA*, LXII, 206 f., in the course of an article, "The 'Vis' of Menander."

infants in *Samia* and *Epitrepontes* must be considered separately, though it is true that they have much in common. The life and status of each baby are threatened in the course of the plays, and each in the end attains a position of security when he and his parents are united in the triangle—familiar from the *Iliad*—of father, mother, and son. It would be rash to assume, as has been done, that the plot is concerned only with the difficulties of the parents; the status of the babe may be equally important. The difference between *Samia* and *Epitrepontes*, which is fundamental, is that in the former play the baby, being recognized by his father, depends for his security on the latter's success in acquiring a legal status for his family, for, unless he can be legally married, the father is powerless to protect his offspring. The baby has his place in the plot, but his interest is bound up with his father's and need not be considered separately.

In the *Epitrepontes*, on the other hand, the infant is a foundling and must depend for help on the tender mercies of strangers; it is only after a recognition scene that his father will take an interest in him. Before that, his adventures are independent, and the audience are intended to feel an interest in his fate even apart from the effect on his parents' happiness. It is a striking, though apparently unnoticed, fact that the plot of the *Epitrepontes*, which, as always in New Comedy, is a success story, is constructed about the baby as hero. This does not mean that the baby has personal characteristics or that the emotions and reactions of other characters in the play do not contribute greatly to the intensity of the scenes in which his fate is at stake. Menander follows the example of Sophocles, who makes Electra the most prominent character in a play the plot of which is concerned with the success story of Orestes. Again in the *Antigone* it is Creon's downfall that is the theme of the play, though interest is centered in Antigone. So in the *Epitrepontes* the profoundest interest is created by the wife Pamphila's noble devotion to her ideal of marriage and by the psychological crisis through which the husband Charisius passes before he resolves to take his wife's part in spite of her, as he supposes, illegitimate child.<sup>7</sup> The plot, however, is constructed about the success story of the baby. It is a case where, to quote Aristotle, there is *mythos*

<sup>7</sup> I.I. 524-47 in Jensen's edition (Berlin: Weidmann, 1929).



without *ethos*, as far as the baby is concerned.<sup>8</sup> The moral and psychological elements of the play are its brightest jewels; the thread on which they are strung, and which they tend to obscure, is the fate of the baby.

Two scenes in particular have been considered by critics to be either superfluous or disproportionately long—the scene in which the baby's fate is decided by the arbitration of Smicrines and the final scene, in which Smicrines learns that the baby is his grandson.<sup>9</sup> The place of these two scenes in the plot becomes clear enough once we observe the orderly steps by which the outcast infant rises from destitution to his rightful position in life. In the first act we discover that his birth had estranged Charisius from his young wife Pamphila, for the latter had been violated at a night festival four months before her marriage, and Charisius had been informed of the birth of a baby that could not, he thought, be his. In the second act the infant appears in person. He had been found by Davus, a goatherd, and had thus escaped death. Since Davus, however, was chiefly interested in the jewels exposed with the child, his hope of survival would have been small if Syrisus, a charcoal-burner, whose wife had just lost her own suckling, had not offered to assume responsibility for the foundling. A month later Syrisus heard about the trinkets that Davus had pocketed, and now he lays claim to them. They are a means of establishing the child's identity; without them he would have life, but not liberty or a place in his family and his city. An arbitrator is found in Pamphila's father Smicrines, who happens to pass that way. His verdict, which favors the babe, is crucial for the infant's fate and so to some extent for that of Pamphila and Charisius. Far from being extraneous, the trial scene is of the first importance for the plot. If Smicrines had not awarded the child to Syrisus, that would have been the end of the story. When this scene is presented dramatically, the audience can be trusted to feel to the end an increasing concern for the infant's fate.

<sup>8</sup> *Poetics* vi. 13 f. 1450<sup>a</sup>. C. R. Post in his essay, "The Dramatic Art of Menander," *Harv. Stud.*, XXIV (1913), 111–45, gives no hint that the baby is as much, or more, a part of the plots of *Samia* and *Epitrepontes* as the parents. Wilamowitz in his edition of the *Epitrepontes* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1925), p. 123, says of the arbitration scene: "Es ist wirklich eine in sich abgerundete Szene, nur lose mit der Haupthandlung verbunden."

<sup>9</sup> So A. W. Gomme in the footnote on p. 266 of his chapter on "Menander" in *Essays in Greek History and Literature* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1937). Gomme's chapter is a sober and well-reasoned answer to scholars who belittle Menander.

Our hero's life is now secure, but he is still threatened with loss of identity and the permanent status of a slave. A new champion appears in Habrotonon, a harpgirl who is hired but not loved by Charisius. It will be a beautiful revenge for the young man's indifference if she can make him recognize her as mother of his son and accept responsibility for her future. She gets the opportunity because Charisius' servant has recognized among the infant's belongings a ring that Charisius had lost. Not daring himself to call his master's attention to the ring, he lets Habrotonon use it. By clever acting she wins recognition for the baby as Charisius'. This brings freedom for herself and a step up in the world for the infant, who is now the illegitimate son of a wealthy citizen. The next step is due again to Habrotonon, who discovers that Charisius' son and Pamphila's are one and the same. The babe is now a citizen, the third member of a moral triangle.

One last step remains for the final act, which is by no means superfluous. Smicrines is not aware of the infant's existence and has every intention of forcing his daughter to divorce her husband. Even after the reconciliation he could have made out a good case legally. Charisius had undoubtedly bought the freedom of the harpgirl, who thus became Pamphila's rival and sufficient cause for a divorce. Naturally the baby is a trump card, and Smicrines' purpose suffers a complete reversal when he sees his grandson. It is a striking fact in Greek life that a baby was often a decisive argument for marriage or against divorce.<sup>10</sup> It is true that the married pair were bound to defeat Smicrines with such a card to play, but the actual playing of the card is good fun, and such a storm as had been raised in Smicrines demanded serious handling to insure a final calm with which to end the play. Grandfathers were important people in Athens, and it was no anticlimax that the conquest of Smicrines was reserved for the last act that brought the infant hero full recognition as a member of the family.

I need not point out the similarity of this plot to the familiar theme

<sup>10</sup> Recently a modern parallel has appeared in St. John Irvine's play, *People of Our Class*, produced in London in the spring of 1938, and reviewed in the *Spectator* of May 20, 1938, on p. 911. The heroine "announces to her father that he can take his choice between having a bastard grandchild or paying up" and permitting a marriage not arranged by himself. This is the situation that confronted many Athenian fathers, if we are to believe the evidence of New Comedy.

of folklore, the infant exposed to die who becomes a great leader: witness Moses, Cyrus, and Romulus. Since comedy did not deal with kings, Menander's infant could not rise higher than he did. In Euripides' extant tragedies we have two stories of infants who escaped death to become kings and ancestors of kings, namely, in the *Ion* and the *Andromache*. In the latter, Andromache's son, traditionally called Molossus, is old enough to sing a plaintive duet with his mother (ll. 501-36) but takes no other part in the play that decides that he is to be a king. He is as helpless as Menander's infant, but his success is a clue to the labyrinth of a plot that seems at first sight to be merely episodic. Hermione must elope with Orestes in order to leave the field clear for Andromache, and Neoptolemus must die to insure the succession of Molossus. Otherwise Neoptolemus might marry and beget legitimate sons who would oust Andromache's son from the succession. This is not to say that Andromache's fate is not equally important, but her success and status depend chiefly on the status of her son. So in the modern Orient the wife is raised or depressed to some extent according to the status of her son. Verrall maintained that the *Andromache* must be the sequel of a lost play.<sup>11</sup> It is indeed a sequel, but of an extant play, the *Trojan Women*. The latter play redresses the balance of fate for Andromache, who, as she had formerly lost all, now becomes again a queen and mother of a line of kings. It is not improbable, moreover, that the play was written for one of those same kings, namely, the Tharyps who is mentioned in Thucydides (ii. 80. 6). He introduced Greek life among his people and was made a citizen of Athens (*IG*<sup>2</sup>, II, 226). According to pseudo-Andocides *Against Alcibiades* (41) an ambassador once influenced his people in favor of Athens. A play by Euripides, wherever it was produced, would serve as compliment and propaganda at once. The anti-Spartan tirade of lines 445-52 was hardly needed by the Athenians; it is probably a warning to the Molossians. The Spartan characters in the play are sufficiently blackened and their enmity to Tharyps' ancestor could not be more marked. If the presentation of the *Andromache* was intended to celebrate and cement an alliance between Tharyps and Athens

<sup>11</sup> A. W. Verrall, *Essays on Four Plays of Euripides* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1905), p. 4. For Verrall's discussion of the *Ion* see his edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1890).

against the Spartans, it is not surprising that the establishment of Molossus as prince is made the final outcome of the action.<sup>12</sup>

In the *Ion*, which exploits the Athenian interest in a legendary king of their own, the hero is represented as old enough to take part in the action, though he is still young enough to question the morality of the gods. Of course, Apollo had to be Ion's father because of the historical fact that all Ionians recognized Apollo as *πατρῶς*, as Plato points out in the *Euthydemus* (302d). The moral question is conveniently shelved by the intervention of Athena *ex machina*, a course that was not open to Menander. The violator in his play must repent to justify the happy ending.

In these two plays of Euripides the plot in each case deals with the success story of an illegitimate infant, and in each case the psychology, theology, and domestic difficulties that are introduced seem to the modern reader to provide the chief interest of the play. What is apparently unique in Menander is the tender age of the hero, who is about a month old. A plot with such a helpless infant as its central motive might easily sink to the level of sheer melodrama; but Menander, like Euripides, grafts onto his plot a moving and sincere story with psychological and moral depth, and the graft overshadows the conventional plot. Likewise in *Hamlet* the genius of Shakespeare so focuses attention on the mind and emotions of the hero that, when the villain finally dies, it hardly seems to matter. In the original *Hamlet* from which Shakespeare took his plot, the bloody ending was the main attraction of the play. Aristotle was wrong; it is not plot that matters most, but profound appreciation of human character and the ability to depict significant moral decisions. In Menander plot and

<sup>12</sup> In the sixth edition of Christ-Schmid *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*, I, 362, the suggestion is made that the *Andromache* was improvised for a performance at the court of Tharyps. It seems possible that a special performance in honor of Tharyps was given at Athens without appearing on the usual records of dramatic competitions. This might explain the scholiast's explicit statement (on l. 445) that the play had never been produced at Athens. D. L. Page has, however, found a new argument for supposing that the *Andromache* was presented at Argos, in the elegiacs of ll. 103-16, which belong to the Doric tradition of threnodic elegy and are unique in Attic tragedy (*Greek Poetry and Life* [Oxford, 1936], pp. 206-30: "The Elegiacs in Euripides' *Andromache*"). The fullest argument for a connection with Tharyps is that of D. S. Robertson, "Euripides and Tharyps," *CR*, XXXVII (1923), 58-60. I believe that the close connection of Hermione's elopement and the death of Neoptolemus with the ultimate fate of Molossus has not hitherto been stated. The plot is sufficiently unified, once it is realized that the fate of Molossus was of supreme importance to the original audience.

character and decision are interwoven to produce a varied appeal that satisfies all tastes.

In our second play, the *Samia*, there is no need to explain the infant's part in the plot, for his fate depends on the wedding of Moschion, his father, and Plangon, his unmarried mother. When the infant, however, is actually seen on the stage, driven first from one house, then from the other, both times in the arms of his temporary protector Chrysis, we have a visible symbol of the vicissitudes of the potential family. A threat to one member of the ultimate moral triangle is a threat to all. That here, as in Homer, the baby is a symbol of morality is a fact to be carefully digested, since in Menander the baby is not born in wedlock. In the process of digestion we shall see why a Greek play of young love required a baby, being in this utterly unlike modern drama; for the usual romantic drama nowadays depicts the union of two persons, not three, and in our love scenes a baby would appear incongruous indeed. Menander's heroines are always women in distress, partly no doubt because Greek drama that did not depict tragedy (*παθητική*) was, as we learn from Aristotle,<sup>13</sup> expected to depict virtue rewarded by success after difficulties (*ἡθική*). Women in distress were powerful factors in the appeal to sympathy, particularly when they were depicted in childbirth.

Aristotle's word for sympathy is *τὸ φιλόανθρωπον*, which is evidently not the same thing as *ἔλεος*. The latter is tragic and appropriate after a *πάθος* that affects some entirely innocent person.<sup>14</sup> Tentatively I assume that *τὸ φιλόανθρωπον* differs from pity and fear merely in so far as the misfortunes of the victim are not bloody or irretrievable enough to produce tragic catharsis. New Comedy, like the *Odyssey*, appeals to our sympathy; and the happy ending has our moral approval, since success and happiness come to the deserving. Its function is not catharsis but entertainment and instruction; hence

<sup>13</sup> *Poetics* xiii. 11-13 (1453<sup>a</sup>); xxiv. 3 (1459<sup>b</sup>); see also my article, "Aristotle and Menander," which will appear in *TAPA*, Vol. LXIX.

<sup>14</sup> For *τὸ φιλόανθρωπον* see Aristotle *Poetics* xii. 3 f., where Aristotle refers to our antipathy for the bad man and approval of his suffering. Conversely we must sympathize with the bad man's victims and their joy at his fall. Aristotle would presumably use a single term for what I call sympathy and antipathy. He considers this kind of plot appropriate to comedy (*ibid.* xiii. 13), referring evidently not to Old Comedy but to the early stages of New Comedy. So "Longinus" compares the *Odyssey* to "comedy of manners" (*On the Sublime* ix. 15).

the term *κωμῳδία ἡθική*, "comedy of manners," in a sense that includes morality in the word "manners" and largely excludes satire. Modern "comedy of manners" is much more light-hearted than anything in Menander. Life was harder in ancient times; almost anyone might become a slave or an outcast. I wonder if modern refugees who are homeless and friendless can enjoy light comedy. The need for sympathy engenders the capacity for sympathy. Suffering with which one is familiar one's self is matter for sympathy, not tragedy; so Greek tragedy dealt with extraordinary pains—comedy dealt with such ordinary and passing pains as childbirth.

It is an interesting fact that, while childbed and the nursery have little place on the modern stage, they are recurrent themes in moving pictures. The vagaries of censorship and performance are such that it is difficult to use in criticism the material provided by the cinema. It may be noted, however, that the action pattern of the moving picture with its rapid depiction of incident and rather obvious emotions is an excellent clue to the interest of New Comedy. The familiarity and naturalness of detail make for intimate and friendly sympathy with the characters. The more harrowing the circumstances, the greater the interest of the audience in the ultimate happiness of the protagonists. As a parallel to Menander's childbirth scenes, enacted just offstage, I can cite the moving picture *Wells Fargo*, in which a subordinate character died in childbirth. Just a glimpse was afforded of the mother in travail, and her agonized cry was heard for a moment. I mention this point because one critic at least finds such scenes too harrowing for comedy.<sup>15</sup> In such cases sympathy is all for the mother. Once a baby is born, however, its fate is a lively subject of interest to Menander, and babes are preserved by ancient instruments of fate as extraordinary as the Wells-Fargo Express Company in the modern story. When babies die in Menander, they are babies outside the plot, and their deaths are convenient because they leave mothers free to provide for the nourishment of more fortunate infants who are at the center of interest.<sup>16</sup> The surviving babies' vicissitudes are threatening

<sup>15</sup> Gomme, *op. cit.*, pp. 249-95 and 295 n.

<sup>16</sup> Syrisus' wife has lost her baby at *Epitrepontes* 50 f. There is no conclusive evidence in the case of Chrysis in the *Samia*; she has borne a child that is not mentioned in the play.

enough to maintain concern, but their ultimate triumph preserves the happy mood of comedy—not the comedy of laughter but that of intelligent and lively sympathy, of friendly humor, not biting wit or satire.

It was the social conditions of courtship and marriage in ancient Athens that forced the dramatist to include babies in his love stories. We may divide Greek dramatic infants into two classes, those who are wanted and those who are not wanted. The baby of the *Epitrepontes* was originally unwanted, thanks to a misunderstanding. Hence he must make his way independently without help from his parents. He must find champions whose action ultimately removes the misunderstanding, making him now a much-wanted baby. There is a reversal and recognition in one that would have delighted Aristotle;<sup>17</sup> there is irony in making a baby that separated Charisius and Pamphila become later the strongest bond of their union. In modern English literature an unwanted baby may be a symbol of immorality and may play a conspicuous part in such a tragedy as that of Hetty in *Adam Bede* or of Tess in Hardy's novel. There is no tragedy of an unwanted babe in Greek—for the sufficient reason that unwanted babies were at once dealt with in much the same way as we deal with superfluous puppies. We may regret the necessity of disposing of them, but dispose of them we do. The Greeks did not, as we do, capitulate to infants at sight; hence their fate must be decided; and the decision of their fate was material for drama.

In the *Samia* we have an example of the wanted baby; at least his parents, the youthful, and as yet unmarried, Moschion and Plangon, want him. They want him and they want each other; and he is the instrument by which they arrive at legal marriage. He is at once a tool of intrigue and a symbol of the morality and permanence of the union of three persons in one family that is the object of the intrigue. The paradox, that a baby born out of wedlock is a guaranty of morality, needs explanation. If I am right, the point cannot be too strongly emphasized, for it runs counter to the first assumption of every scholar who turns from English to Greek literature—the assumption that there is fundamental immorality in a situation that for Menander was prerequisite, if he was to tell a love story at all. He begins in the *Samia* and demonstrably in other plays, for instance, the *Georgus*, with

<sup>17</sup> See *Poetics* xi for reversal and recognition.



a liaison between a comparatively wealthy youth and a poor girl, who appears in the play as the mother of a baby. It should be noted that, if there is a subsequent marriage, there is no disgrace in such a situation. The family that results is as stable and happy, probably more so, than if the young people had not chosen each other spontaneously. It is true that a girl without dowry might lose her hope of marriage if there were a scandal;<sup>18</sup> but, if her lover had promised to marry her, his family were in no position to repudiate the promise.<sup>19</sup> Legally all the advantages were with the girl's family, if they had a fair opportunity to appeal to the law. If there was no male relative, or if the girl's brother, as in the *Georgus*,<sup>20</sup> had no resources, the prosecution might fail; but there is plenty of evidence that the young man who seduced a citizen's daughter might be held severely to account. Thus the youth who was in love and feared that his father would not consent to a marriage could force consent by confronting his parent with a situation of which matrimony was the only solution, dowry or no dowry.<sup>21</sup> Similarly the mother, nurse, or even the responsible guardian of a girl might abet a liaison that would presumably lead to matrimony.<sup>22</sup>

It is an excellent corrective of our notions of morality (note that I propose to correct them merely as a temporary critical expedient to make Menander intelligible), to turn to the modern Orient and see how marriages are arranged there. In a recent story in the *New Yorker* a Chinese girl's marriage was described. From it I note four points: (1) a young woman twenty-five years old was more disgraced by

<sup>18</sup> Terence *Adelphoe* 345 f.: virginity is next to a dowry. That the birth of an illegitimate baby did not prevent marriage in the case of a rich girl is clear from Plautus *Persa* 387: "Dum dos sit, nullum vitium vitio vortitur."

<sup>19</sup> Note Aeschinus at *Adelphoe* 333 f.: "Qui se in sui gremio positurum puerum dicebat patris ita obsecraturum ut liceret hanc sibi uxorem ducere." The mother of Aeschinus' future wife was content to wait for their marriage until the baby was born. She clearly expects aid from the law if there is difficulty.

<sup>20</sup> In the *Georgus*, frag. 1 (Jensen: 93 Koch), the girl's brother is dissuaded from invoking the law against the seducer because as a poor man he will be lightly esteemed.

<sup>21</sup> In *Georgus*, frag. 5 (Jensen: 100 Koch), a seducer is reproved for not giving notice of his situation in view of the marriage that his father is arranging to no purpose. So at *Adelphoe* 693, Micio reproves Aeschinus: "Credebas dormienti haec tibi confectores deos?"

<sup>22</sup> In the Cairo *fabula incerta* a father returns from a journey to find his son living with a girl who has borne him a son. The girl's guardian is a party to the arrangement, though the father must consent before his son's marriage is legal.

virginity than by any possible marriage arrangement; (2) any relative could be asked to pay a dowry to secure her marriage, and the richest and most unencumbered relative had the greatest obligation;<sup>23</sup> (3) when it was found inconvenient to provide a dowry, a clause was inserted in the marriage contract by which the bride's relatives agreed to take her back in case the husband lost his job; (4) the ceremony mattered little to the dignity of the union. In these points Greek custom was not far from the modern Chinese and did not resemble English custom at all. To us marriage is holy matrimony, and any procreation out of wedlock is unholy. To the Greeks a baby without a marriage was a much better guaranty of permanent union than a marriage without a baby. Since an undowered bride might be sent home at any time without a penalty, it was particularly important that a dowerless girl should be united to her husband by a baby. The mother to some extent gained standing through her children, and here again ancient Greece resembles China and the Mohammedan countries. The mother of children could be sent home, but the children remained the responsibility of the father. In practice a wife with children was not likely to be divorced, nor would she seek divorce under ordinary conditions. In any case her husband would feel the obligation to get a home for her by marrying her to someone else, unless her own relatives could provide for her. If a husband preferred to live with some other woman than his wife, he might do so. If she were rich and had no children, she would normally seek a divorce; otherwise she would remain with the children, and the separation would involve no legal steps. Marriage was a private matter. Morality and marriage were not the concern of the state, except as they affected citizenship. A citizen's daughter could not be insulted or seduced with impunity, but the citizen must take steps himself to protect his daughter. If a citizen's daughter had no male champion, she could not hope for legal redress.<sup>24</sup>

The Chinese marriage that I have cited was not a love match. It must not be supposed, however, that love matches cannot occur in countries where women are secluded as in China and in ancient Greece.

<sup>23</sup> So Plato in *Epistle* xiii. 361d is represented as obligated to provide dowries for his grandnieces, since he is richer than their fathers. For the Chinese see Emily Hahn, "The Modern Girl," *New Yorker*, April 2, 1938, p. 46.

<sup>24</sup> Terence *Adelphoe* 455: "in te spes omnis, Hegio, nobis sitast."

Plato would give young people an opportunity to see one another at festivals and so to marry with some acquaintance and liking as a basis for lifelong union.<sup>25</sup> The evidence of New Comedy shows how often clandestine acquaintance led to love and marriage in Greece. For modern China there is evidence that similar customs produce similar results. I quote from Lin Yiu Tang:

Even in her deepest seclusion every girl generally learned about all the marriageable young men of her class in town and secretly distributed her approval and disapproval in her heart. If by casual chance she met one of the approved young men, even though it was only an exchange of glances, more than likely she succumbed. . . . Then a period of secret stolen courtship began. . . . She might come to expect a child. There might be interminable waiting and delay. If the girl became seriously lovesick, . . . her parents, alarmed at the situation, would then begin to make inquiries and save her life by arranging the desired marriage, and so they might after all live happily ever after.<sup>26</sup>

The more one studies the conditions of Greek life, the clearer it becomes that, if Menander was to tell a success story having as its goal the union of two lovers, he had to provide them with a baby. If two people are in love and no one objects to the marriage, there can be no drama. They get married and that is all. If a marriage is arranged for two people who are not in love, no drama can result, because no profound feeling is involved. For drama there must be spontaneous love confronted by obstacles. Where there is foreseen parental opposition to a romance, some evidence of the lovers' serious devotion to each other is also required to make good drama. In Shakespeare the lovers Romeo and Juliet are united by a clandestine marriage; the rest of the story is concerned with their efforts to remain united. Now Menander could not unite two lovers by a clandestine marriage, since marriage in Athens did not occur without the parents' consent. In some periods of literature a glance or a kiss has been a sufficient seal of permanent love. Such romantic attachments were not, however, considered to be binding, even in literature, until there arose in Provence in the twelfth century, fostered by chivalry and the Christian ideal of chastity, the modern institution of courtship. The only technique that Menander

<sup>25</sup> *Laws* 771e: χορεύοντας καὶ χορευούσας κόρους καὶ κόρας καὶ ἅμα θεωροῦντάς τε καὶ θεωρουμένας.

<sup>26</sup> *My Country and My People* (rev. ed.; New York: John Day, 1939), p. 156.

knew to indicate that two lovers were united in mutual love was to provide a baby, recognized by the father as his; he thereby obligated himself to support it and to marry the mother. Since the penalty for seducing a citizen's daughter was severe, any young man who laid himself open to the penalty must have had serious intentions.<sup>27</sup> He was just the opposite of the frivolous rakes that some critics seem to find in Menander. Presumably the girl's father would care enough about her future to acquiesce in her marrying the father of her child. If his character was, however, as irascible as that of Niceratus in the *Samia*, he might sacrifice his daughter's future to his lust for vengeance. Niceratus' decision in the *Samia* is long delayed.<sup>28</sup>

Thus the clandestine baby in Menander is the dramatic equivalent of a clandestine ceremony in Shakespeare. In Menander as in Homer the baby is symbolic of true union as opposed to immoral and transient bilateral relations. It is a startling and hitherto overlooked fact that for a Greek audience the presence of the baby makes the story moral and raises its theme above triviality. We have observed in Homer that the babe Astyanax is a pledge of married love. The Greeks had no such thing as holy matrimony; they did, however, realize that marriage should be more than partnership in procreation or than partnership in housekeeping. It was a partnership in life according to Aristotle, Menander, Plutarch, and the marriage contracts found among Egyptian papyri.<sup>29</sup> A contract of marriage did not imply union for life; normally it contained in itself provision for the dissolution of the marriage. The husband might dissolve the marriage if his wife was unfaithful, and in any case if he repaid the dowry or arranged for his wife a marriage with another man. The wife could not act without her

<sup>27</sup> The plight of Chaerea in the *Eunuchus* (954-58) is evidence of this. In the *Georgus* (18 f.) the seducer is in terror of the girl's brother.

<sup>28</sup> *Samia* 240-68. Demeas' chatter is not amusing in itself, but his anxiety for an understanding without an explanation would be readily appreciated when acted.

<sup>29</sup> Plato *Laws* iv. 721a (cf. 771e): ἡ τῶν γάμων σύμμεξις καὶ κοινωνία. Cf. Xen. *Oec.* vii. 30: καὶ κοινωνοὺς ὥσπερ τῶν τέκνων ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν, οὕτω καὶ ὁ νόμος (τοῦ οἴκου) κοινωνοὺς καθίστησι; Aristotle *EN* 1162<sup>a</sup>. 20-22 (viii. 12. 7): οἱ ἄνθρωποι οὐ μόνον τῆς τεκνοποιίας χάριν συνοικοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν εἰς τὸν βίον; Menander *Ep.* 536: *Pamphila*: κοινωνὸς ἦκειν τοῦ βίου ἐφασκεν; Papyrus B.G.U. 1052, 13 B.C., *Select Papyri* (Loeb) i. 3. 7: πρὸς βίου κοινωνίαν; Plutarch *Moralia*, frag. 4 (Bernadakis vii. 152): συνοικοῦσιν, οὐ συμβιοῦσιν, of husbands and wives who disagree. "They share a house, but not a life."

guardian, if she had one. The wife's father had full authority, if the man broke his contract of marriage, to remove his daughter, by force if necessary, from her husband's house and bring suit for recovery of dowry. The view of marriage as a life-partnership, while it appears in literature, was not recognized by the law. It was an ideal for people with superior ideals. The common view is expressed by a speaker in Lysias, that only when there is a baby can a marriage be considered stable.<sup>30</sup> It is the converse of this proposition that one who desires marriage desires also children. The best way for a Greek youth to show that he was serious about marriage was to accept responsibility for a baby born. There are no love scenes in Greek drama; the babies are our best evidence that there were such scenes in Greek life.

HAVERFORD COLLEGE  
HAVERFORD, PENNSYLVANIA

<sup>30</sup> The whole question of courtship and marriage among the Greeks needs to be reviewed in the light of what New Comedy tells of popular customs and ideals. The laws about marriage in ancient Greece have been thoroughly studied, largely from evidence supplied by speeches in the law courts. A little reflection, however, makes it clear that in our own society the ideals of married life are ill represented in the courts. Current fiction provides a better clue, though of course there are pitfalls here too. The latest, best, and fullest treatment of Greek marriage is that of Walter Erdmann, *Die Ehe im alten Griechenland* (München: Beck, 1934). For trust in a wife after the birth of a baby note Lysias i. 6: ἐφύλαττόν τε ὡς οἶόν τε ἦν καὶ προσείχον τὸν νοῦν, ὥσπερ εἰκὸς ἦν. ἐπειδὴ δὲ μοι παῖδιον γίγνεται, ἐπίστευον ἤδη.

## LEGAL EXPRESSIONS AND IDEAS OF JUSTICE IN AESCHYLUS

H. G. ROBERTSON

### I

A STUDY of Aeschylus' diction and imagery reveals an extensive use of legal expressions and legal metaphors. Terms from the law courts are used quite literally when the situation makes them appropriate, notably in the *Eumenides*. They are also used metaphorically in passages dealing with questions of justice and injustice or right and wrong. Unfortunately, it is not always easy to make a sharp distinction between legal and nonlegal language. Words which ordinarily have no technical significance may acquire it when used in certain phrases or certain contexts. In this way the Greeks often avoided coining specifically technical words. Hence it is difficult in many cases to determine where the ordinary use of a term ends and the technical use begins. Another difficulty arises from the fact that poets, in order to avoid prosaic terms, may sometimes disguise technicalities by the use of synonymous expressions.

The following list is the result of an attempt to show the prevalence of legal terms in the extant plays and to classify them in the various groups suggested above. There appear to be no certain examples in the fragments.

#### A. EXPRESSIONS USED LITERALLY

##### I. TECHNICAL PHRASES

ἀγῶν κριθήσεται (*Eu.* 676, 744), an expression which might occur in prose.

ἀνευ κλητῆρος (*Su.* 622). The scholiast interprets this as meaning that they showed their hands before a vote was called for.

ἀπρόξενοι (*Su.* 239), obviously in its technical sense, although this involves an anachronism.

ἀφαιρεθεῖς (*Su.* 932), used in its legal sense of "robbed," "deprived of one's property."

γνωσθεῖσαν (*Su.* 7), the simple verb instead of καταγιγνώσκω, as in *IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 10. 29.

γόνω (*Su.* 172) is a legal term equivalent to φύσει (cf. *Lys.* xiii. 91).

διαγνῶναι δίκην (*Eu.* 709) has a prosaic flavor.

δαιρεῖν (*Eu.* 472, 488, 630) is technical in the sense of "decide."

δικαστής. In *Eu.* 483 δικαστής is used by Athena in speaking of the institution of a court. In δικαστήν ἢ δικηφόρον (*Ch.* 120) the contrast is between trial by legal procedure and summary punishment by a ruler.

δίκη is used in the technical and concrete senses of "cause" (*Su.* 1071, *Eu.* 719), "trial" (*Eu.* 224, 730), and "penalties," or "punishments" (*Eu.* 187). In the last named the bad connotation is unusual. δίκας κρίνοντες (*Eu.* 682) is a prosaic legal phrase. δίκας διδοῖεν (*Su.* 703) means "permit legal action," "grant the right to use the courts."

δίκαιον (*Eu.* 619), like δίκη, is used in the special sense of "plea."

διώκων (*Eu.* 583), in the sense of "prosecutor."

ἐγγύτατα γένους (*Su.* 388), a legal phrase (cf. *Isaeus* x. 5).

εἰσάγω τὴν δίκην (*Eu.* 582). Athena uses the regular technical formula in opening the trial.

ἐξελεγχε (*Eu.* 433) belongs to the language of the courts.

καταγνωσθῇ (*Eu.* 573) is a technical word found chiefly in prose.

κρίνω δίκην is used three times in a technical sense (*Eu.* 433, 468, 734). κρίνον (*Eu.* 613) does not refer to a verdict but to an opinion introduced as evidence.

μαρτυρέω and μαρτυρία (*Eu.* 485, 576, 609, 797, 798) occur in the ordinary legal sense.

μάρτυς (*Eu.* 664), here in the sense of "real evidence."

ὄρκον (*Eu.* 489) appears to refer to an oath taken by the members of a court. In *Eu.* 429 it refers to an oath taken by the accused. Bonner and Smith (*The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle*, II, 170) show that Orestes could not take an oath of denial, since he admitted homicide but pleaded justification. Thus the charge is of the kind that was tried in the Athenian court of the Delphinium, where likewise the accused took no oath.

πᾶγμα (*Eu.* 470, 488, 584, 630), in the technical sense of "case." Cf. also πᾶγος (*Su.* 233).

πράσσουσα (*Ch.* 311), in the sense of "exacting." Another use appears in πράξαντα (*Eu.* 624). From the meaning of "exact" (punish-



ment) the word comes to mean "punish," and hence may take an accusative of the crime (cf. *A.* 1285).

*προξένοις* (*Su.* 919), a reference to the well-known practice of requiring foreigners to be represented by citizens in legal proceedings.

*προστάτης* (*Su.* 963), a reminiscence of Athenian law, which required that a metic should have a *προστάτης* as his legal representative.

*τεκμήρια* (*Eu.* 485) is one of the technical terms used by Athena in speaking of the institution of a new court.

*ὑπεύθυνος* (*Per.* 213). The term is deliberately chosen to suggest the legal position of an Athenian magistrate, even though the rhetorical effect of the speech is weakened. In *Pro.* 326 the term suggests the legal restrictions upon an Athenian magistrate as contrasted with the absolute monarchy of Zeus.

*ὑπόδικος* (*Eu.* 260), a legal term found in the orators.

*φεύγειν* (*Su.* 390), in the secondary sense of "urge in your defence." In *Eu.* 652 it indicates the accomplishment rather than the attempt and hence may be translated "acquittal." In *Eu.* 752 this is emphasized by the use of the perfect of *ἐκφεύγω*.

*ψῆφον*, used with *φέρειν* in *Eu.* 674-75 and with *αἶρειν* in *Eu.* 709, suggests the method of voting in Athenian courts. Another possible instance is *Eu.* 678, where *ψῆφον* may be understood with *τιθεῖσ'*.

## II. POETIC VARIANTS

*αἰτία*. In *φύγη ματαίων αἰτίας* (*Su.* 229), if the correction *ματαίων* is sound, we appear to have an equivalent of *ἐνέχεσθαι αἰτίας* or *ἀπολύεσθαι αἰτιῶν*.

*ἀντίποιν' ὡς τίνης* (*Eu.* 268) suggests the prosaic *δίκην δίδοναι*.

*δημόπρακτος ἐκ πόλεως μία ψῆφος κέκρανται* (*Su.* 942-43) is an elaboration of the formula *ἔδοξε τῷ δήμῳ*.

*δικαστῶν βουλευτήριον* (*Eu.* 684), a variant for the prosaic *δικαστήριον*.

*εὐξυμβόλους δίκας* (*Su.* 701-3) is suggestive of the technical phrase *δίκαι ἀπὸ συμβόλων*. There may be another reminiscence of the institution in lines 383-84.

*κυρώ δίκην* is a phrase found only in *Eu.* 581 and 639.

*ἔδοξεν κτλ.* (*Su.* 605-14). These lines contain an elaborate poetical paraphrase of the language of Athenian decrees.

μεταίτιος (*Eu.* 199), equivalent to the more prosaic συναίτιος, "accessory."

ὀρκώματα (*Eu.* 486) appears to refer to something in the nature of evidentiary oaths. The word is found only here and in 768 where it has no legal significance.

πάλους (*Eu.* 742), a poetic variant for ψήφους.

παντελῇ (*Su.* 601), equivalent to κύρια, "valid."

πεμπάζετ' ἐκβολὰς ψήφων (*Eu.* 748), doubtless a grandiloquent variation of a formula from the courts.

ποινάς πρᾶξαι (*Eu.* 203), a poetic equivalent of δίκην λαβεῖν.

πρᾶγος (*Su.* 233), poetic for πρᾶγμα in the sense of "case."

τέλος δίκης (*Eu.* 243), a majestic phrase, but with a legal flavor, τέλος being virtually equivalent to κρίσιν. Compare also αἰτίας τέλος (*Eu.* 434) and κύριον τέλος (*Eu.* 544). In *Eu.* 729, however, τέλος τῆς δίκης means "authority to decide the case."

χειροπληθύεται (*codd.*, *Su.* 604). The reading is very uncertain but there is probably a reminiscence of the technical χειροτονέω.

ψῆφον προσθήσομαι (*Eu.* 735) seems to combine the ideas of the technical ψῆφον θήσομαι, "I shall cast a vote," and προσθήσομαι, "I shall aid."

## B. EXPRESSIONS USED METAPHORICALLY

### I. TECHNICAL PHRASES

ἀντίδικος (*A.* 41), legal adversary. This is the first appearance of the figure of a case at law which runs through the play. The word has a distinctly legal flavor (cf. Aeschin. ii. 105, Antiphon i. 2; Lysias vi. 13; Dem. lviii. 20).

ἀτέλειαν (*Eu.* 362). Headlam, in a note in his translation, explains this as a figure from the institution of liturgies, meaning "exemption." εἰς ἀγκρισιν ἐλθεῖν in 364 then means "come to inquiry"; Liddell and Scott translate "begin proceedings."

ἄτιμος (*Eu.* 884; cf. 215, 780, 824, and ἀτιμία in 796). The primary meaning is probably uppermost, although there is some hint of the legal implications. Dumortier (*Les Images dans la Poésie d'Eschyle*, p. 255) takes it in its legal sense.

ἀτίται (*A.* 72), possibly "unhonored" (Liddell and Scott), but more probably in the legal sense of "unable to pay," "defaulters."

δικάζεις φυγήν (A. 1412) is a prosaic legal phrase.

δικαστής (A. 1421) carries on the legal figure of δικάζεις (1412) and emphasizes the officious censoriousness with which Clytaemnestra charges the chorus.

δίκη (Th. 461), used figuratively in the sense of "plea." δικά Δίκα (Ch. 461) is probably rightly translated by Tucker "[The Wargod will meet their fighting], Justice their pleading."

ἐκπράξω χρέος (Su. 472), exact payment of a debt.

ἐξεμαρτύρει (Eu. 461). The compound is not used here in its special technical significance, although it has a legal flavor. There is no question of extrajudicial depositions. The same applies to A. 1196, where the compound is simply a more emphatic synonym of μαρτυρέω, as in Aeschin. i. 107. Dumortier (*op. cit.*, p. 249) has a different interpretation, apparently identifying ἐκμαρτυρία with ἔξωμοσία.

κατήγορος (Th. 439), an obvious legal metaphor. Headlam's "true evidence" is better than Liddell and Scott's "betrayed."

κλητήρα (Th. 574). The legal meaning is not inappropriate here. The conjecture λητήρα is plausible, but unnecessary.

λύσασθ' (Ch. 804), cause to be paid, redeem.

μάρτυρες (Eu. 318). As frequently, Aeschylus uses legal language in speaking of retribution.

μαρτυρήσων (A. 1506), obviously borrowed from the language of the courts.

μέτοικος (Per. 319). There is grim humor in the contrast with the normal connotation of legal rights and privileges. In A. 57 the term is figuratively applied to the birds, who are metics in the realm of Zeus and, like human metics, are dependent on others for legal protection. In Eu. 1011 the term has a suggestion of its technical significance in contrast with πολίταις.

μετοικία (Eu. 1018), the status of a metic, an echo of 1011.

μηχάνημα (Ch. 981). Mazon (*Eschyle*, p. 79) explains this as follows: "Oreste prétend prouver que tel engin est l'arme d'un bandit, et, d'après la loi, tout bandit, si son crime est flagrant, doit être exécuté sans jugement." Elsewhere in the speech Orestes uses legal phraseology in urging the justice of his cause. Thus we have ἐχει δίκην (990), μάρτυς (995), and μετῆλθον (996).

δρίζει (Ch. 927), a technical term used of fixing a penalty.

ὀφλῶν δίκην (A. 534). The figure of a case at law is developed at length in this speech in technical and half-technical language.

πράκτορες (Eu. 319) suggests the legal sense of πράσσομαι (cf. also A. 111).

πρασσομένα (A. 705), in the legal sense of "exacting punishment." A. 1285 is a well-known crux, opinion being divided between the manuscripts reading ἄξειν and the conjecture πράξειν. The latter may mean "exact" (a penalty) or, by a shift of meaning, "punish." Hence we have such phrases as φόνον πράξαντα (Eu. 624). δικάων θ' ὦν ἐπραξάμην (A. 812) shows the original use.

προδίκους (A. 450) involves a legal metaphor. The sense of "advocate" is not entirely appropriate, unless Ἀτρεΐδαις is an example of a "two for one" figure, referring only to Agamemnon (cf. Bell, *Latin Dual and Poetic Diction*, pp. 8 and 54). Headlam translates "principals in the quarrel," apparently taking it as an example of etymologizing.

συντελής (A. 532), usually "paying taxes with another," is here by an extension used to signify "paying the penalty with another."

τεκμηρίοισιν (A. 1366) has obvious legal associations. Dumortier (*op. cit.*, p. 253) suggests that legal figures are to be observed in other words in this passage, i.e., βουλεύματα, γνώμην λέγω, τοπάζειν, and πληθύνομαι. τοπάζειν could be regarded only as an accidental anticipation of the orators' fondness for εἰκότα arguments, while the rest seem to suggest political discussion rather than legal procedure.

τίνειν (A. 1325). In view of the uncertainty of the reading it is difficult to say whether the passage refers to vengeance or to punishment by judicial award.

ψῆφος (Th. 198) in this context suggests condemnation by democratic legal procedure. Compare ψ. καταγνώσεως (Thuc. iii. 82). Such anachronisms do not trouble Aeschylus.

## II. POETIC VARIANTS

ἀμπλακημάτων (Pr. 112), used instead of ἀδικημάτων or other prosaic synonyms.

ἀνδρηλατεῖν (A. 1419), equivalent to ἐκβάλλειν.

αἰτιάματι (Pr. 196), for the commoner and more prosaic αἰτία, suggests the figure of a case at law which occurs occasionally in the play.

ἄποιν' (A. 1420), instead of its more prosaic cognate *ποιναί*.  
*ἀπόξενος* (A. 1282, *Ch.* 1042, *Eu.* 884) may be regarded as a poetic equivalent of *φυγάς*.

*δατητάς* (*Th.* 943), like *λυτήρ νεικέων* (940), suggests the giver of a judicial award, who should normally be the reverse of *πικρός*.

*διαλλακτῆρι* (*Th.* 909) is reminiscent of the institution of arbitrators.

*δίκαιον* (*Ch.* 308), according to Tucker, means "just plea" or "justice" in the concrete instance (cf. *Eu.* 619). Headlam translates it "Justice."

*δίκαν παρέξει* (A. 1511-12) is a poetic variant for *δίκην δώσει*.

*ἐκτίνειν θέμιν* (*Su.* 435-36), equivalent to the prosaic *διδόναι δίκην*.

*κραίνειτ' <δίκας>* (*Ch.* 462) may be an echo of the language of the courts.

*κτανόντας κτλ.* (*Ch.* 144), a paraphrase of the language of laws regarding homicide (cf. *IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 10. 29-30). Other echoes occur in 312-13 and 400-402.

*μέτεμι* (A. 1666, *Ch.* 273, *Eu.* 231), a variant for *διώξω* in a partly legal sense. In *Eu.* 583 the prosaic word is used.

*μηνυτήρος* (*Eu.* 245), a poetic equivalent of *μηνυτοῦ*.

*νείκος κτλ.* (*Su.* 935-36). *τὸ νείκος δ' οὐκ ἐν ἀργύρου λαβῇ ἔλυσεν* is poetic for *τὸ ἔγκλημα οὐ χρημάτων λήψει διέλυσεν*.

*ξυνδίκως* (A. 1601) suggests the technical *σύνδικος*, a quaint Aeschylean use of metaphor.

*ποινὰς τίνω* (*Pr.* 112), a poetic equivalent of *δίκην δίδωμι* (cf. 178-79 and 620).

*φονίαν πληγὴν τινέτω* (*Ch.* 312-13) combines in poetic language the ideas of *τεθνάτω* and *δίκην δίδωτω*.

*ψήφους ἔθεντο* (A. 816-17) suggests the prosaic and technical *ἐψηφίσαντο* and thus governs *φθοράς*. The figure of the urns reflects the method of voting at Athenian trials (cf. *Ar. Ath. Pol.* 68. 4).

#### C. EXPRESSIONS WITH SLIGHT LEGAL CONNOTATION

*αἰδουμένους τὸν ὄρκον* (*Eu.* 710). Von Erffa (*Αἰδώς und verwandte Begriffe*, p. 95) sees in this a legal formula.

*αἰκείας* (*Pr.* 179) is used here in the sense of "outrage," as elsewhere in tragedy, but in conjunction with *ποινὰς τε τίνειν* it could not but suggest the technical sense which it bore in Attic law.

ἀπέδικες (A. 1410) may be connected with δίκη by fanciful etymologizing. The line is an echo of *Iliad* ix. 63.

ἄτιμος (Eu. 215) inevitably suggests the legal state of ἀτιμία. Aeschylus does not hesitate to use homely figures in speaking of august personages.

ἀτίτας (Eu. 257) is not a technical word, but it suggests the blood-feuds of prelegal times as contrasted with criminal trials.

βαλοῦσα ψῆφος (Eu. 751). Probably a metaphor from dicing, but with a hint of the idea of casting a vote.

βούλιος (Su. 599), following ἔργον, suggests the deliberative function of government as compared with the executive (cf. note in Headlam's translation).

δίκην, used with δώσει (Su. 733) and ἀπαιτῶ (Ch. 398), has a legal flavor.

ἐπηύθυνε (Per. 860), a slight suggestion of εὐθύνη in the legal and political sense. This would emphasize the paradoxical effect of the whole speech in the mouths of Persians.

εὐθυνος (Per. 828). It is difficult to say how far the prosaic sense of "public examiner" and the more poetic sense of "corrector" were felt to be different (cf. Eu. 273).

ισοψῆφος (Eu. 741, 795) looks like a technical term, although found only in this play in this sense.

κυκλούμενον (A. 997). Dumortier (*op. cit.*, p. 246) interprets this by reference to ἱερῶ ἐνὶ κύκλῳ (*Iliad* xviii. 504). It is simpler, however, to take the word in the sense of "agitated," derived from the primary meanings of "dance," "go in circle."

κυρίῳ (Su. 732) with ἡμέρᾳ in this context carries a suggestion of "the appointed day of trial."

κῶρος (Su. 391), the authority of a legal κύριος.

ξυνδίκους (Su. 726), a suggestion of the public advocates at Athens (cf. also Eu. 761).

πλειστηρίζομαι (Ch. 1029). Tucker may be right in translating "I offer for full warrant."

ρύσιον, ῥύσια. In Su. 314 it means "restitution" or "deliverance." There may also be a hint of its legal implications, the gesture of touching involving an assertion of proprietorship (cf. Vürtheim, *Aischylos' Schutzfliehende*, pp. 38-39 and 383-84). In Su. 412 it suggests the figure of property seized in distraint. In Su. 728 it refers

to the primitive practice of self-help, for which compare Bonner and Smith, *op. cit.*, I, 11-15. In A. 535 it is used in the sense of "booty," but has a legal flavor, since it is suggestive of the development from freebooting and self-help to judicial procedure.

*συνήγορον* (A. 831), although used in the primary sense of "agreeing with," is somewhat reminiscent of the legal associations of the word.

*συγκαλῶν* (Su. 517), a suggestion of the technical *σύγκλητος ἐκκλησία*.

*τίμημα* (Ch. 511). The word has legal associations, but Dumortier (*op. cit.*, p. 254) can hardly be right in taking it here in its full legal sense.

*τίνει χρέος* (A. 457), a familiar half-technical figure.

*φερέγγυον* (Eu. 87) has a legal flavor.

*φεύγομεν* (Su. 5), in both the primary sense of "flee" and the secondary sense of "be in exile."

## II

It is obvious that these legal expressions are very unevenly distributed over the seven plays. They are most frequent in the *Eumenides*, as would be expected. They are fairly common in the *Suppliants*, *Agamemnon*, and *Choephoroe*, but relatively rare in the other plays. This cannot be a mere accident but indicates a varying emphasis upon legal ideas and concepts of justice. This is confirmed by other considerations. The relative frequency of the word *δίκη* and its derivatives furnishes a rough indication of the extent to which Aeschylus endeavored to use his plots to set forth problems of law and justice. A count of these words gives the following result:

Play	No. of Words	Play	No. of Words
Suppliants.....	25	Agamemnon.....	49
Persians.....	0	Choephoroe.....	40
Seven against Thebes..	19	Eumenides.....	80
Prometheus.....	8		

The evidence of statistics may be further confirmed by a consideration of the plots of the plays. In the *Suppliants* the action is based upon the conflict between the suppliant maidens and the Egyptian suitors, who typify, respectively, *δίκη* and *ὑβρις*.<sup>1</sup> The *Persians* does not aim to set forth the justice of the Greek cause and the injustice of Persian aggression. The cause of the action is the reckless folly of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the writer's paper "Δίκη and Ὑβρις in Aeschylus' *Suppliants*," *Classical Review*, L, No. 3 (1936), 104-9.



Xerxes and tragic pity is evoked by the disaster which he brings upon a great nation. In the *Seven against Thebes* claims are made, in the usual manner of belligerents, that one side is "just" and the other "unjust," but the chief contrast is between the impious insolence of the attackers and the steadfast heroism of Eteocles. This and the influence of the hereditary curse are the chief sources of the action. We have no data for passing judgment upon the question at issue between the two brothers. The *Prometheus* ends with a protest against injustice (1093), echoing the charge of injustice at the beginning (30), and the punishment of Prometheus is sometimes referred to in terms of a criminal case at law. This figure, however, is used very sparingly, and Aeschylus emphasizes not the justice or the injustice of the acts of Prometheus and Zeus but the clash of their personalities and the conflict between the *αἰθαδία* of Prometheus and the *τραχύτης* of Zeus. It is a commonplace of criticism that we are left in some doubt as to the view which Aeschylus intends us to take of the rights and wrongs of the matter. In the *Oresteia* Aeschylus turns a primitive tale of intrigue, ambition, and lust for vengeance into a drama to set forth fundamental problems of justice. Men's conflicting claims and ideas and the clash between old and new religio-legal concepts and institutions are dramatically set forth, the universal power of divine justice is impressively asserted, and a solution is sought by reducing old and new, divine and human principles to a synthesis.

We may conclude that the *Suppliants* and the *Oresteia* are chiefly concerned with problems of justice, while the *Persians* and the *Prometheus* reveal slight interest in them. The *Seven against Thebes* occupies an intermediate position; while assertions are made about justice, no real problems are stated. This may account for the fact that, while *δίκη* and its derivatives occur fairly often, legal expressions are very few.

Mazon, in the introduction to his edition (p. vii), suggests a more general interest in questions of justice in all the plays: "Eschyle comprend que l'essence du drame doit être cette idée de justice, qui s'est incorporée à la définition même de l'homme. Tout acte humain pose une question de droit. La tragédie traitera donc des questions de droit." This obviously assumes that justice is to be interpreted in a very wide sense, and it is quite true that Aeschylus' conception of it is sometimes very general. If he had lived to be questioned by Socrates,

he would probably have had difficulty in framing a definition of justice which would distinguish it from related virtues or from the whole of virtue. Nevertheless his use of the Greek terms indicates, more often than not, a restricted and definite conception. The principal uses of *δίκη* in his plays appear to be as follows:

1. In the general sense of "right," "the law of the universe."<sup>2</sup> Connected with this is the use of *δίκη ἐστὶ*, "it is right."<sup>3</sup>

2. In the more restricted sense of "fair dealing," "justice" as a social virtue.<sup>4</sup>

3. In the concrete senses of "plea" or "claim for justice,"<sup>5</sup> "trial,"<sup>6</sup> and "judgment" or "punishment."<sup>7</sup>

4. In the adverbial use of the accusative, meaning "like," "in the likeness of."<sup>8</sup>

In the first of these senses *δίκη* and *δίκαιος* may be used of any virtue or any right action; in the second they are applied to one of the separate cardinal virtues. It is only in the former sense that *δίκη* could be regarded as the theme of all seven plays.

One further point may be added. *Δίκη* in Aeschylus is sometimes a principle upheld and enforced by Zeus or the gods.<sup>9</sup> At other times it is a personified power which directs the course of events or influences them by the awe which it inspires in men.<sup>10</sup> These two ideas are combined when *δίκη* is referred to as the daughter of Zeus.<sup>11</sup> Here, as elsewhere, Aeschylus teaches the universality of the laws of justice.

VICTORIA COLLEGE  
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

<sup>2</sup> *Su.* 709; *Th.* 605; *Pr.* 30; *A.* 383; *Eu.* 163, 539, 725.

<sup>3</sup> *Th.* 866; *A.* 259, 811; *Eu.* 277.

<sup>4</sup> *Su.* 80, 384, 406, 916, 1071; *A.* 1615, 1669; *Ch.* 144, 398, 995, 1027; *Eu.* 224, 272, 414, 439, 486, 610, 888, 891.

<sup>5</sup> *Su.* 1071; *Th.* 584; *A.* 813; *Eu.* 492, 619.

<sup>6</sup> *Su.* 703; *A.* 534; *Eu.* 243, 580-82, 639, 682, 709, 719, 729, 732, 752, 795.

<sup>7</sup> *Su.* 231, 733; *Pr.* 9; *A.* 812, 1511; *Ch.* 462, 804, 935, 998; *Eu.* 187, 230, 433, 468, 472, 573, 734, 795.

<sup>8</sup> The distribution is very uneven: *Su.*—1, *Th.*—1, *A.*—14, *Ch.*—5, *Eu.*—4. This may be purely accidental or it may mean that Aeschylus was influenced by the verbal association of *δίκη* in its other senses.

<sup>9</sup> *Su.* 402-4, 437; *A.* 250 (cf. 177-78).

<sup>10</sup> *Su.* 343, 395, 709; *Th.* 415, 646; *A.* 250, 772, 911, 1607; *Ch.* 61, 148, 244, 311, 461, 497, 639-41; *Eu.* 511, 516, 539.

<sup>11</sup> *Th.* 662, *Ch.* 949.

## THE LATIN PERFECT FORMS IN *-ISTĪ* AND *-ISTIS*

WALTER PETERSEN

IT HAS long been considered an established fact that the *-is-* of the endings of the second persons singular and plural in the Latin perfect tense, e.g., in *ēgistī* and *ēgistis: agō*, contains the *s* of the IE *s*-aorist<sup>1</sup> with preceding formative vowel. Recently various scholars<sup>2</sup> have expressed the opinion that the *s* made its way into these forms already in the IE parent-language, since Hittite and Tocharian show similar, although not identical, forms in the second persons of both numbers as well as in the third person singular. Both of these assertions, however, will bear a critical examination, for the conditions under which the *s* occurs, on the one hand, in Latin and, on the other hand, in Hittite and Tocharian vary so widely that one cannot avoid the suspicion that the identification of these various occurrences of the *s* is based on a merely superficial similarity and is as illusive as the conclusions of earlier<sup>3</sup> linguists that any formative *s* in any language with any function whatsoever was a remnant of the verb *\*es-*, 'be.' To this consideration must be added the indisputable fact that no adequate explanation has been found why the forms from the *s*-aorists should have been fastened upon the second persons<sup>4</sup> in Latin. An expected thematic *\*-i-lī* in the singular and *\*-i-lis* in the plural would have been unobjectionable phonetically and no more ambiguous

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Sommer, *Handb.*<sup>2</sup>, pp. 574 f.

<sup>2</sup> So Bonfante, *Emerita*, I, 165; Benveniste, *Festschrift Hirt*, II, 230; Bechtel, *Hitt. Verbs in sk*, p. 23.

<sup>3</sup> So even recently Hirt (*Idg. Gram.*, III, 191 f.) partly derived the nominal suffix *-es-* from the IE *\*es-*, 'to be.'

<sup>4</sup> The explanation offered in Brugmann, *Gr.*, II, 3, 606, is inadequate. That by Benveniste (*loc. cit.*) is no "explanation" at all. He maintains that the *s* in Latin as well as elsewhere has no other purpose than to "facilitate inflection." It is obvious, of course, that such vague motives, as in fact all conscious motives, can have played no part in the creation of new forms, which are always based on analogies which work without any purpose of the speaker. At the most such a consideration might be operative in the perpetuation of one of two or more rival forms, but with their origin it can have no connection.

(the former less so) than the corresponding *-i-t* in the third person singular and *-i-mus* in the first plural.

The difference between the conditions under which the *s*-forms are found in Latin as against Hittite and Tocharian shows itself not merely in their occurrence also in the third person singular in the latter two, however significant that will prove to be. Just as important is the difference between the nature of the tense formations in which they occur. In Hittite the *s* is found only in the preterite of the *hi*-conjugation, a preterite built upon the IE perfect, the latter having become the Hittite present of the verbs in *-hi*. It thus was a purely Hittite<sup>5</sup> condition which led to the existence of this formation, and the preterite of the *hi*-conjugation cannot as such go back to the IE period. Nothing can be more improbable than that a formative *s* which occurs only in this new tense should be an IE inheritance in this particular function, as must be assumed by those who identify the Latin with the Hittite forms.

On the other hand, the Latin perfect is never an aorist or imperfect derived from an IE perfect, the only preterite of this nature being labeled as pluperfect, which, however, corresponds to the Hittite preterite of the *hi*-conjugation neither in form nor in use. It is true, of course, that the Latin perfect is a syncretistic tense into which IE aorist as well as perfect forms made their way, but the two do not exist side by side in different meanings, but one or the other won out, and the resulting conglomerate forms designated as perfect are all semantically identical. Moreover, while it cannot be doubted that the sigmatic aorist also played a large part in this syncretism, it is important that whenever origin from the IE *s*-aorist is certain, this *s* is not confined to one or two personal endings but appears throughout the tense or mood in which it occurs. Thus in the perfect of *regō* the *x < gs* occurs throughout the system, as in the indicative *rēxī, rēxistī, rēxīl, rēximus, rēxistis, rēxēre -runt*. Similarly the formative *-er- < -is-* in the perfect subjunctive and in the future perfect goes through the entire paradigm, e.g., *ēgerim, ēgerīs, ēgerit, ēgerimus, ēgeritis, ēgerint*. In contrast to this is the alleged appearance of the same *s* in the personal endings *-istī* and *-istis*. It is particularly dubious that the *s* of the sig-

<sup>5</sup> More accurately one should say Tocharo-Hittite, since, as appears below, the identity of the Hittite and Tocharian *s*-forms indicates a common origin.

matic aorist should have made its way twice into such forms as *rēxistī* and *rēxistis* without our being able to advance an acceptable reason.

To find a better explanation, let us reconstruct the paradigm of the *s*-aorist as it must have appeared before it became infected by the perfect in the Italic period. A comparison of the *i* which precedes the personal endings in four of the six Latin forms, e.g., *rēx-i-t* and *rēx-i-mus*, with such Oscan-Umbrian forms as Osc. **manaf-u-m** (1. sing.) 'mandavi' or **kúmben-e-d** = Lat. *convēn-i-t*, shows distinctly that Italic perfects, in as far as their endings were derived from the secondary endings of the aorist, whether they were sigmatic or not, had adopted the thematic type of inflection. It is indifferent for our purpose whether the resulting *-so-* *-se-* was the direct descendant of an IE *so*-aorist, or whether the thematic inflection was an Italic development. By all means we may reconstruct as Italic the following combinations of stem suffix *-so-* and personal endings: sing. 1. *-so-m*, 2. *-se-s*, 3. *-se-d*; pl. 1. *-so-mos*,<sup>6</sup> 2. *-se-tes*,<sup>6</sup> 3. *-so-nd*. If these endings had continued into Latin of the historical period without analogical change, the paradigm of the perfect of *regō* would have been: *\*rēxum*, *\*rēxis*, *\*rēxid*, *rēximus*, *\*rēxitis*, *\*rēxund*. Of these presupposed forms, *rēximus* actually exists, and *rēxit* differs from *\*rēxid* only by the substitution of the primary ending *-t* < *-ti* for the secondary *-d* < *-t*, as also in imperfects (e.g., *amāba-t*) and everywhere in the original sphere of the secondary endings. Thus two of the six forms of *rēxī* come directly from the old *so*-aorist, and *rēxistis* differs from *\*rēxitis* only by its medial *s*, whereas *rēxistī* can be analyzed as *rēxis-tī*, i.e., it may well be the old aorist *\*rēxis* extended by *-tī*, the ending of the perfect. In other words, *rēxistī* was a contamination of the original aorist *\*rēxis*, a form parallel to *rēxit* in the third singular, with *\*rēxitī*<sup>7</sup> which had adopted the ending of the perfect.

<sup>6</sup> Since no Oscan and Umbrian examples of the first and second persons plural are extant, *-mos* and *-tes* are based upon the Latin only. Of these, the latter, because it shows an innovation from the original IE form, cannot be considered certain, but the precise form of the personal ending in the Italic period does not affect the problem here discussed.

<sup>7</sup> Similarly Burger (*REL*, IV, 214) derives, e.g., *plēstī*, the short form of the second person singular of *plēvi*, from a thematic *s*-aorist, assuming an aorist second person singular, *\*plē-s*, to which the same ending *-tī* from the perfect was added.

This contamination was by no means confined to the sigmatic aorist but took place as well in other thematic aorists which entered into the Latin perfect system. Thus from the root *fū-*, 'become, be' = Gr. *φύ-* Skt. *bhū-*, comes *fuistī*, which is the aorist *\*fuis* contaminated with *\*fuitī*.

I propose, therefore, to derive *-istī* in all Latin perfects with aorist stems from an infection of forms in *-is*, the old aorist ending, with parallel forms in *-tī*, which originated in the perfect. This *-tī* I also, according to the generally adopted theory,<sup>8</sup> consider to be the IE *-tha* of Skt. *vēt-tha*, Gr. *οἶσ-θα*, etc., with its *-ī* due to the influence of *-ī* < *-ai*<sup>9</sup> in the first person singular.

The contamination of *-is* and *-tī* to *-istī* required no further favoring conditions in those perfects, which, like the *s*-perfect, were derived from the IE aorist. It was largely an effect of the uncertainty as to which ending to use at the time when the syncretism between perfect and aorist took place, so that, e.g., a vacillation between the old aorist *\*rēxe-s* and *\*rēxe-tai*, with the ending of the perfect, resulted in the compromise *\*rēxestai*, which became Lat. *rēxistī*.

The adoption of *-istī* for *-tī*<sup>10</sup> by those Latin perfects which go back to the IE perfect tense may be explained merely through the influence of the aoristic perfects. However, there were certainly additional factors involved in those old perfects which had roots in a dental. Again we must go back to the Italic period before the complete syncretism of perfect and aorist, when the original perfects still retained their old athematic inflection in all forms. At that time the addition of *-tai* (Lat. *-tī*) to *\*yoid-* resulted first in *\*yoid-tai*, which probably became *\*yoissai*, it is true, but the *t* of *-tai* was restored from all the other stems, so that *\*yoistai* (Lat. *\*vīstī*) resulted. Similarly *\*tu-tus-tai* (Lat. *\*tutustī*): *tud-*, 'strike' (Lat. pres. *tundō*). Somewhat later, during the period of syncretism of the perfect and aorist, *\*yoid-e-s* (Lat. *\*vīdis*) and *\*tu-tud-e-s*, with thematic vowel and personal ending of the

<sup>8</sup> Cf. e.g., Sommer, *Handb.*<sup>2</sup>, p. 574; Brugmann, *Gr.*, II, 3, 606.

<sup>9</sup> An analogy is offered by the Tocharian middle second singular in *-te*, e.g., *kālpāte*, which derived its *-e* from the first person in *-e*, also the IE *-ai*, but in its original middle use. Cf. *Lang.*, XII, 163.

<sup>10</sup> When Latin forms and words are quoted in their extant forms, chronological questions are occasionally ignored if they are either irrelevant or if the relative chronology of some details cannot be determined.

aurist, appeared alongside, and again compromise forms resulted: \**yoistai* + \**yoides* = \**yoidestai* (= Lat. *vīdistī* with *is* for *es* after, e.g., *agis* in the present),<sup>11</sup> and \**tu-tustai* + \**tu-tudes* = \**tu-tudestai* (Lat. *tutudistī*).

The old perfects with nondental stems thus had a double pattern for the adoption of *-estai* Lat. *-istī*, on the one hand, those whose roots ended in a dental, and, on the other hand, all perfects which come from IE aorists. In both instances the essence of the matter was contamination of the aorist ending *-e-s* Lat. *-i-s*, which must certainly have existed in all thematic aorists, with *-tai* Lat. *-tī*, the ending of the original perfects. In view of the ease with which these forms, the existence of which before the syncretism of aorist and perfect is beyond doubt, explain the extant Lat. *-istī*, it is inconceivable that, e.g., the *-is* of \**rēxis* had nothing to do with *rēxistī*, and that the *-is* of the latter came from the *s*-aorist and made its way into the ending of the second person singular in some inexplicable way.

The ending *-istis* in the second person plural received its *-is-* mainly by a proportional analogy with the singular in *-istī*. Thus, in terms of Latin<sup>12</sup> of the historical period: \**ēgītī*:*ēgistī* = \**ēgitis*:*ēgistis*; \**vīstī*:*vīdistī* = \**vīstis*:*vīdistis*. In case of dental roots contamination of old athematic perfect forms with thematic forms under the influence of the old aorist yielded the same result. A thematic \**tu-tud-i-tis* (Ital. *-e-tes*) beside the athematic \**tu-tus-tis*, parallel to the singular \**tu-tus-tī*, yielded the extant *tutudistis*. It is obvious that these dental forms also could have acted as patterns for nondental roots.

The theory that the *-is-* of *-istī* and *-istis* is not an aorist suffix but the thematic vowel *i* < *e* with the secondary personal ending *-s* thus disposes of three serious objections to the aorist theory. It does not assume that the *i* of *tutudistī* and *tutudistis* is different from that of *tutudit* and *tutudimus* but refers them all to the thematic vowel. It does not assume that an earlier \**rēxis*, which must necessarily have existed, has nothing to do with the extant *rēxis-* of *rēxistī*, but disappeared and then later reappeared. It does not fail to explain why the Latin forms with *-is-* occur only in the second persons.

<sup>11</sup> The question of the appearance of *i* in a medial closed syllable instead of expected *e* is common to *-istī* and *-istis*. Probably, e.g., *ēgistis* for \**ēgestis* after \**ēgitis*, and *ēgistī* for \**ēgestī* after *ēgistis* as well as *agis*.

<sup>12</sup> See n. 10.



Over against the advantages of the view here presented it does not weigh so heavily that there is a superficial resemblance between the Latin and Tocharo-Hittite in the occurrence of *-st-* in the endings of the second persons of otherwise unrelated tenses with past meaning. Only if the *s*-forms of the latter could not be explained independently would such a resemblance be disconcerting, but, as it is, we have before us merely one more instance in which similar (in this case not identical) results come from widely divergent origins.

In contrast to the mere similarity of the Latin *s*-forms with those of Hittite and Tocharian is the complete original identity of those of the two latter. In the second person singular Hittite *-sta*, e.g., in *memi-sta*, 'thou didst say,' or *dai-sta*, 'thou didst place,' is the same sound for sound as the Tocharian *-št*,<sup>13</sup> e.g., in *weñā-št*, 'thou didst say,' the latter having lost a final short vowel represented by Hitt. *-a*. In the second person plural Hitt. *-sten*, e.g., in *meme-sten* or *dai-sten*<sup>14</sup> goes back to an earlier *\*-ste* which is also the original of Toch. *-s*, e.g., in *weñā-s*, for after dropping of the final short vowel also the preceding *t*, which had become final, was lost. In the third person singular both languages show a mere *-s*, e.g., Hitt. *da-s*, 'he took'; *nai-s*, 'he led'; Toch. *yāmā-s*, 'he made.' It is clear that this perfect correspondence of the *s*-forms of Hittite and Tocharian in the three instances as opposed to the existence of the *st* only in two of the forms in Latin and the complete absence of *s*-forms in the third, even by itself shows the common origin of the *s* of the two languages on the eastern periphery. On the other hand, the identity with them of the Latin forms is not self-evident and in any case would require more proof than mere assertion, all the more so since the divergent origin assumed above for the latter clears up all the difficulties which result from connecting them with the *s*-aorist.

The illusiveness of the similarity of the two Latin forms with those of Hittite and Tocharian is brought out still more by the probable origin of the latter. The Hittite shows the genesis of all three with particular clarity. In the second person singular *-sta*<sup>15</sup> is a contamina-

<sup>13</sup> IE *st* became Toch. *št*.

<sup>14</sup> These forms occur only as imperatives, but that is accidental, since the Hitt. imperative second plural is always identical with the preterite indicative.

<sup>15</sup> The third person singular in *-sta*, e.g., *tarne-sta*, may be due to a similar contamination of *-s* and *-ta* functioning as personal endings also here, or it may be the result of the tendency to use the same form in both persons (see n. 17).

tion of the regular *-ta* (IE *-tha*) of the *hi*-conjugation with the secondary ending *-s*,<sup>16</sup> which the form *tarna-s* (Sturtevant, *HG*, p. 286) shows to have existed also in the *hi*-conjugation. In the third person singular *-s* beside *-s* of the second person is due to the tendency of the second and third persons to assume identical forms,<sup>17</sup> and the form *tarna-s*, just quoted, is extant in both values, and similarly *dai-s* is both 'thou didst place' and 'he placed.' In the second person plural *-sten* is the result of a proportional analogy to the singular, i.e., *s* is carried over from the corresponding *-sta* of the latter: *-ta:-sta = -ten:-sten*. The two *s*-forms involved occur beside each other in the very same verb in case of *memi-sta* (i.e., *memesta*) and *meme-sten* (extant as imperative), and the older *-ten*, also presupposed by the analogy, is found, e.g., in the following forms of *hi*-verbs: *pahas-ten:pahas-*, 'protect'; *akten:ak-*, 'die'; *tarna-tten:tarna-*, 'put in.' I thus return to the explanation of the Hittite *s*-forms rejected in *AJP*, LIII, 201, in favor of the sigmatic aorist theory of Marstrand (Char. Ind., pp. 84 ff.) and others. The objections there formulated have been shown to be groundless by the intervening forms which have just been cited, and otherwise the advantage of operating with extant Hittite formations instead of assumed IE inheritances of a problematic nature is so obvious that one may at least conclude that origin of *-sta*, etc., from an *s*-aorist is extremely improbable, particularly after realizing that also the Latin *s*-forms find a much better explanation on the basis of purely Italic occurrences.

Since Hittite still shows plainly the lines on which the *s*-forms of the *hi*-preterite developed, we may draw the conclusion that the identical *s*-forms of Tocharian had the same origin, but that the millenniums which intervened up to the time of the Tocharian documents had obscured the nature of the *s* by the elimination of mediating forms and by establishing a regular paradigm with no competing endings. However, a trace of the analogical extension of the *s* is to be sought in the *-š*<sup>18</sup> of the third person singular present, e.g., *kārsnā-š*, 'he knows,' which could not possibly have been the stem suffix of the

<sup>16</sup> The Hittite preterite, with endings partially derived from IE secondary endings, was heir to the IE imperfect as well as historical perfect (cf. *AJP*, LIII, 202).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, p. 203.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. n. 19.

aurist but perhaps came from the preterite,<sup>19</sup> which in turn derived it from the -s of the second singular in the same way as the Hittite.

However, no matter what the details of the process may have been, the complete identity of the Hitt. -*sta*, \*-*ste*, and -s with Toch. -*st*, -s, and -s forces us to assume that the two languages developed their s-forms in common. On the other hand, the widely different circumstances under which the s occurs in Latin as well as the certainty that the Latin s-forms arose from a contamination of aorist and perfect forms in a syncretistic tense that is built up out of aorist as well as perfect elements also otherwise, leads to the conclusion that the resemblance of the Latin forms to those of Hittite and Tocharian is accidental and that its s-forms were developed independently during the Italic period and later.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

<sup>19</sup> I am sure now that -s is IE -si, the primary ending of the second person singular. This would be additional evidence that Tocharian at one time was disposed to use the same endings in the second and third persons singular.

## LISTS OF PROVINCES IN PTOLEMY'S *GEOGRAPHY*

AUBREY DILLER

THE *Geography* of Ptolemy has suffered from neglect by the science of classical philology. It has never been published with even an approximation of adequacy. The maps present special difficulties because they require extensive facsimiles. But even the standard complete text, by Nobbe (1843), is not critical; and this lack is still unsupplied by the two unfinished editions of Wilberg (1838-45) and Müller-Fischer (1883-1901) and the partial editions of Germany by Cuntz (1923) and of India by Renou (1925). Müller burdened his apparatus with readings of some forty MSS; but the oldest MS of all, the Urbinas, which is the archetype of a large part of the others, he was unable to use because it was mislaid in the Vatican Library. The recent facsimile publication of this whole MS, text and maps,<sup>1</sup> has furnished at last a firm basis for future study, already begun by the great work of Joseph Fischer, S.J., which accompanies the facsimile. The *Geography* presents an unusual number of problems in structure and arrangement, the relation and authenticity of its various parts often being questionable. This article will present a certain complex of evidence that seems to throw light on some of these problems.

For topographical purposes Ptolemy divides the *oikumene* into distinct parts which he calls *chorai*, or more specifically, *eparchiai* and *satrapeiai* (*Geogr.* ii. 1). In his descriptive text (ii. 2—vii. 4) he treats each section separately and methodically, beginning with its boundaries (*perigraphé*, *periorismos*),<sup>2</sup> then detailing its interior features, especially cities, and closing with the adjacent islands. This arrangement is so simple and clear that one would suppose it perspicuous to all. Yet the fact is that scarcely a single existing copy of the work,

<sup>1</sup> *Claudii Ptolemaei geographiae codex Urbinas graecus 82 phototypice depictus* (Leiden, 1932). *Tomus prodromus*, Jos. Fischer, S.J., *De Cl. Ptolemaei vita operibus geographia praesertim eiusque fatis*.

<sup>2</sup> See Kubitschek, "Studien zur Geographie des Ptolemäus, I: Die Ländergrenzen (ol περιόρισμοι)," *Wiener Sitzb.*, CCXV (1935), 162.

either manuscript codex<sup>3</sup> or printed edition, has preserved it free from distortion and confusion. The edition of Nobbe separates Armenia Minor from Cappadocia, giving 20 chapters in Book v where Müller-Fischer correctly have only 19. But Müller joins the Chersonesus to Thrace and the Peloponnesus to Achaea, giving 15 chapters in Book iii where Nobbe correctly has 17. The errors of the manuscripts are more significant for the history of the text, and we shall pursue them in detail.

My study is based on the following MSS, which are the oldest extant of Ptolemy's *Geography*:

- Urb. Urbinas graecus 82 in the Vatican, 12th cent.
- Ser. Seragliensis graecus 57 in Stamboul, 13th cent.
- N Bodleian Summ. Cat. 3376 (Selden Gk 41), 13th-14th cent.
- C Paris. suppl. gr. 119, 13th-14th cent.
- V Vaticanus gr. 177, 13th-14th cent.
- X Vaticanus gr. 191, 13th cent.

Urb. is published in photographic facsimile (see n. 1). Complete white-on-black photographs of Ser. were purchased in 1937 from the late Professor Adolf Deissmann by the Ayer Division of the Newberry Library in Chicago, which has generously allowed me to use them, together with other valuable Ptolemaic material it possesses. N, C, V, and X I inspected in Europe, C, V, and X only casually. But I have since obtained microphotographs of X through the Edwards Brothers of Ann Arbor, Michigan.

For the classification of the MSS of the text of Ptolemy's *Geography* see O. Cuntz, *Die Geographie des Ptolemaeos* (1923), pp. 1-41; P. Schnabel in *Sitzb. der preuss. Akad., Phil.-hist. Klasse* (1930), pp. 232-34; and A. Diller in *TAPA*, LXVII (1936), 236-38. I gave evidence to show that N, which Cuntz and Schnabel had not inspected, was copied directly from the same archetype as Urb. The readings of Ser. at the critical places now lead to the same conclusion regarding it. Urb., Ser., and N are thus direct copies of a common archetype, and C and V represent a fourth derivative from the same source. X holds a position apart from the others. The variants between X and Urb., Ser., N, C, and V are based on uncials (A, Δ, Λ, etc.), so that the division of the tradition must go back to the uncial period before the ninth century. Moreover, X is very defective. In large parts of the work it omits titles, synopses, subscriptions, and even the numbers for longitude and latitude. On many of the points discussed in this paper, therefore, X gives no evidence.

<sup>3</sup> In the Bodleian MS N a secondary hand of the fifteenth century has undertaken an extensive revision, including a correct renumbering of the *periormoi*. For historical purposes, however, it is necessary to exclude secondary readings. My remarks about N always refer to the primary text.

Fischer (*op. cit.*) has treated the MS tradition of the maps in great detail (see the stemma on his p. 289). After studying his work carefully, I am of the opinion that the only primary MSS of the Ptolemaic maps, aside from the questionable B-MSS, are Urb., Ser., and apparently also Marc. 516. The frag. Fabricianum in Copenhagen, consisting of a single bifolium with parts of four maps, is very similar to Ser., though with many peculiar arbitrary differences. Both are of parchment (Ser., 571 × 420 mm.; Fabr., 565 × 425 mm.), and in the photographs they appear to be in the same handwriting. The hand is quite similar to Paris gr. 1393 of Strabo (bombyc., 490 × 325 mm.), which belonged to Maximus Planudes (*Byz. Zeitschr.*, XXXVII [1937], 297 f.).

There are altogether 84 *periorismoi* in the text ii. 2—vii. 4: 32 in Europe, 8 in Libya, and 44 in Asia. In the MSS each one has a title, such as ἀλουίωρος νήσου βρεττανικῆς θέσις, distinguished from the text by color, size, and style of writing, and above the title there is usually a scroll across the page or column. The Urbinas has adhered to this system rigorously, with the following intentional exceptions. Hisp. Baetica has a supertitle ἰσπανίας θέσις, and the scrolls are omitted for Lusitania and Tarraconensis in a mistaken attempt to subordinate them. The scroll and the word *thesis* are both omitted for the Thracian and Tauric Chersonesi to subordinate them to Thrace and Sarmatia, respectively. Aside from these vagaries, unique in this MS, Urb. maintains the true Ptolemaic arrangement throughout. Ser. has adhered still more rigorously, omitting the scroll or *thesis* in only two instances apparently by mere inadvertence. N abandoned the scrolls after the first few chapters but otherwise preserves the system faithfully. X has no scrolls at all, and in the larger part of the MS the titles are represented only by blank spaces left for the rubricator; but its titles or spaces agree with the other MSS.

The same 84 sections of the *oikumene* are found on the 26 maps, distinguished by colors and inscribed in majuscules with the same names that occur in the *thesis* titles. A striking agreement between the two series of names appears in the Gallic provinces: κελτογαλατία ἀκουιτανία, κελτογαλατία (Urb., γαλλία Ser.) λυγδουνησία, γαλλία βελτική (*sic*), κελτογαλατία ναρβωνησία. Gaul is introduced in the text (ii. 7) as follows: ἡ κελτογαλατία διήρηται εἰς ἐπαρχίας δ, ἀκουιτανίαν καὶ λυγδουνησίαν καὶ βελτικὴν καὶ ναρβωνησίαν. The respective provinces are then introduced with simple names, except Belgica, which is

called *βελτική γαλλία* (ii. 9). The peculiarities of the map legends and *thesis* titles for the Gallic provinces thus originate in the text. In the map legend *ἀλουνίωνος νήσος βρεττανική* a genitive of the text is mistaken for a nominative. The most important divergence between the two series of names is in Egypt, which in the text (iv. 6) has the title *μαρμαρικής λιβύης καὶ αἰγύπτου ὅλης περιορισμός* (instead of *θέσις* only here). On the map this province is inscribed with several nomic names: *μαρμαρική, λιβύη, μαρεώτης, αἴγυπτος, θηβαῖς ἄνω τόποι*.

While the *thesis* titles and map legends in Urb., Ser., N, and X preserve the 84 genuine *periorismoι* with only a few superficial irregularities, nevertheless these same MSS show incipient corruptions of a kind that produces serious errors elsewhere. This is the elevation of mere rubrics into *thesis* titles. The text frequently divides coastlines, or groups inland cities, by tribes or territories indicated by a rubric genitive at the head of the list; and there was a constant tendency for readers and scribes to mistake these subordinate headings for *thesis* titles. In Europe Raetia and Vindelicia are taken together in one *periorismos* and the *periorismos* of Illyria is divided into Liburnia and Dalmatia. Consequently, Vindelicia and Dalmatia are frequently represented falsely as separate *periorismoι*. But the chief instance is Armenia Minor in Cappadocia (v. 6). In Urb. the rubric *ἀρμενίας μικρᾶς* is written in extra large minuscules, though not at all like a *thesis* title in majuscules with a scroll. In N and other MSS, however, the word *thesis* is added and the rubric has become a full title, and there is a space for a title in X, whereas the territory of Armenia Minor is plainly included in Cappadocia. This error is found in one of the earliest testimonia of the *Geography*, the *Hexameron* of Jacob of Edessa (in Syriac, 7th cent.), which lists 32 provinces in Europe, 8 in Libya, and 43 in Asia. Carmania and Scythia Exterior are omitted, and Armenia Minor is separate.<sup>4</sup>

In addition to the text (ii. 2—vii. 4) and the 26 maps there is a third detailing of the sections of the *oikumene* in *Geogr.* viii. 3–28. This part of the work is not a continuation of the text but is intended to accompany the maps. There is a chapter for each map, consisting of a statement of its provinces (*ὁ πρῶτος πίναξ τῆς εὐρώπης περιέχει κτλ.*),

<sup>4</sup> James Darmsteter, "Jacques d'Edesse et Claude Ptolémée," *Rev. des ét. grecques*, III (1890), 180–88; cf. Fischer, *op. cit.*, p. 460.



geographical position and boundaries, followed by a list of its *poleis episemoi* with rubrics for the provinces (*ἀλυνίωνος νήσου, κτλ.*). There are thus two itemizations of provinces in these chapters, one in the accusative in the introductory statement and another in the genitive in the rubrics of the *poleis episemoi*. In the main these two lists agree with each other and with the *periorismoi* of ii-vii. However, Euboea, which belongs to the *periorismos* of Achaea, is listed separately after Crete in the accusative list and before it in the genitive list. Egypt is listed singly in the accusative, but with three separate nomes in the genitive (*μαρμαρικής, λιβύης, θηβαΐδος.*). Media and Susiana are transposed in both lists.<sup>5</sup>

The MS tradition of viii. 3-28 is peculiar. The textual variation exceeds the possibilities of mere copying and must represent different redactions. The structural position of the chapters in the main MSS is significant.

In Urb. chapters 3-30, alternating with the maps, occupy fols. 63-111. Fischer (*op. cit.*, p. 223) says that when Urb. was unbound to be photographed it was found to have thirteen quaternions and one quinternion (fols. 71-80), although the eighth quaternion (fols. 57-62) lacks its last two leaves. Both of the irregularities are pertinent. Fol. 63 is the first of a gathering, and the fact that the atlas part of the codex begins with this leaf is not a mere accident; for the two preceding leaves, now lacking, were doubtless blank, as the text is complete. Chapters 3-12 with the maps of Europe occupy fols. 63-80, chapters 13-16 with the maps of Libya fols. 81-88, chapters 17-30 with the maps of Asia fols. 89-111. Since fols. 71-80 are a quinternion it will be seen that these three parts were deliberately made to occupy separate gatherings. Nor is this all. Most of the maps are drawn on double pages with the accompanying chapters on alternate double pages. The scribe usually placed the chapter on the left of the two pages preceding its map, although it seldom fills even a single page. The chapter thus stands on the verso of the preceding map instead of the recto of the following map, to which it really belongs. But chapters 3, 13, and 17 stand on the right recto pages (63<sup>r</sup>, 81<sup>r</sup>, 89<sup>r</sup>) in order to maintain the separation described above; and chapter 17 on the first map of Asia, which in Ser., N, and X gives 43 *poleis episemoi*, is in Urb. reduced to 30 to fit the compass of a single recto, although the opposite verso is entirely blank. The separation thus arbitrarily carried out serves no purpose in Urb. itself and is in fact concealed there. It is therefore probably traditional.

In Ser., viii. 3-30 with the maps occupy fols. 76-122. Fols. 72-75 appear to be a binion and 75<sup>v</sup> is blank, so that there is an intentional separation in

<sup>5</sup> The genitive list agrees especially with the provinces of the *poleis episemoi* in the *procheiroi kanones* (E. Honigmann, *Die sieben Klimata* [1929], pp. 193-224). For the age of the latter confer Rylands Pap. 522 of the third century (C. H. Roberts, *Catalogue of the John Rylands Papyri*, III [1938], 142-46).

structure here in this codex also. But there is no separation of Europe, Libya, and Asia, and chapter 17 has 43 cities. In N, which has no maps, viii. 2 ends with an extra line on fol. 248<sup>v</sup>, the last of the thirty-second quaternion, and viii. 3 begins with a full title on fol. 249<sup>r</sup>. In C, V, and X there is no separation between viii. 2 and 3, but in chapter 17 C gives only 31 cities and V only 28. Moreover, Urb., C, and V skip five consecutive cities in chapter 22, where Ser., N, and X are complete.

Schnabel (*op. cit.*, p. 229) refers to three late MSS of the *procheiroi kanones* which contain a separate treatise similar to *Geogr.* viii. 3-28. I have inspected Paris. gr. 2399 fols. 33-46 (13th-14th cent.). The text is in a very rough draft as if in process of original composition. It is equivalent to viii. 3-28 but differs widely in form and wording. It contains (fol. 43<sup>v</sup>) a list of provinces entitled *χωραὶ κατὰ τάξιν ἀπὸ δύσεως ἕως ἀνατολῆς*, which agrees with the genitive and accusative lists in viii. 3-28, but does not have the false features of the other lists described below. This treatise appears to be of importance for the history of viii. 3-28, but I was unable to go into the problems it raises.

I conclude from the foregoing evidence that Book viii. 3-28 with the maps were transmitted in a separate volume from Books i-viii. 2. There is other evidence to show that the first volume was once a roll or codex of about 35 lines to a page (see p. 238 below) and later a minuscule codex of octavo size (Diller, *op. cit.*). Neither could have contained the maps, which must always have occupied large sheets.

In the synopsis which all the MSS give at the beginning of Book viii the entry for chapters 3-28 is as follows:

ἐκθεσις πάντων τῶν ὑπογραφῶν αἷς περιέχονται  
 εὐρώπης πίνακες δέκα, χωραὶ κβ̄, πόλεις ριη̄.  
 λιβύης πίνακες δ̄, χωραὶ ιξ̄, πόλεις μβ̄.  
 ἀσίας μεγάλης πίνακες ιβ̄, χωραὶ μβ̄, πόλεις ρζ̄.  
 γίνονται ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τῆς οἰκουμένης  
 πίνακες κς̄, χωραὶ πγ̄, πόλεις τξ̄.

The word *ἐκθεσις* is used in the synopses of the other books to refer to the chapters of the text ii. 2-vii. 4, and the fact that the same term is used for viii. 3-28 shows the crudeness with which these synopses are composed (cf. p. 237). The word *hypographé* apparently refers here to the maps and is un-Ptolemaic in this sense. Notice also the discord *πάντων ὑπογραφῶν*! The numbers of the *chorai* and *poleis* vary in the MSS. I have given them as they occur in Ser. and N. Urb. left blanks for them, and a second hand has supplied κβ̄, ξ̄, μδ̄, ογ̄; ριη̄, μβ̄, ρζ̄, τν̄. The same numbers are found in C and V, and also in X, except that it has ιξ̄. Ptolemy lists 360 *poleis episemoi* in the *procheiroi kanones* and the author of *Geogr.* viii. 3-28 obviously in-

tended to follow this list, although the MSS usually omit a few of them. The numbers of the *chorai* are problematical. I believe that  $\lambda\beta$ ,  $\xi$ ,  $\mu\delta$ ,  $\pi\gamma$  should be read and that we have here a count of the genuine *periorismoι* with an error of one in Libya.

*Geogr.* viii. 3-28 falls into three parts, Europe (3-12), Libya (13-16), and Asia (17-28), which in the MSS are usually signalized more or less by titles and subscriptions. X gives only the following headings:

3. *εὐρώπης πίνακος ᾧ χωραὶ β πόλεις ἐπίσημοι θ.*  
 13. *λιβύης πίνακες δ χωραὶ ξ.*  
 17. *ἀσίας πίνακες ιβ χωραὶ μδ.*

Urb. simply prefixes *ἀρχή* to the titles of chapters 3, 13, and 17 and adds *ὁ καὶ τελευταῖος (πίναξ)* to those of chapters 12, 16, and 28. Ser. likewise prefixes *ἀρχή*, but it has subscriptions after chapters 12, 16, and 28, *τέλος εὐρώπης πίνακες δέκα*, *τέλος λιβύης πίνακες τέσσαρες*, etc. But N, which presents a unique text in viii. 3-28, also gives unique titles and subscriptions:

3. *ἐκθεσις πάντων τῶν ὑπογραφῶν, αἱ περιέχονται  
 εὐρώπης πίνακες δέκα, χωραὶ λδ, πόλεις ριη.*  
 12. *τέλος εὐρώπης πίνακες δέκα.*  
 13. *ἀρχὴ λιβύης πίνακες τέσσαρες, χωραὶ δώδεκα,  
 πόλεις τεσσαράκοντα δύο.*  
 16. *τέλος λιβύης πίνακαί (sic) τέσσαρες.*  
 17. *ἀρχὴ ἀσίας μεγάλης πίνακες δώδεκα, χωραὶ μη,  
 πόλεις ρδ.*

There was probably a significant subscription after chapter 28, but the last leaves of N are lost and the text breaks off in chapter 25. It will be observed that the numbers of the *chorai* are entirely different from those in the synopsis of Book viii and from the *periorismoι*, viz.,

$$34 + 12 + 48 = 94 \text{ v } 32 + 8 + 44 = 84.^6$$

These new summary numbers of provinces in N are the crux of this discussion. They are ancient and widespread in the Ptolemaic tradition. In Codex X there is a remarkable disturbance in the later chap-

<sup>6</sup> Fischer (*op. cit.*, pp. 163-70) has discussed these numbers, but I think his attempt to explain their discrepancies by distinguishing between *chorai* and *eparchiai* is mistaken. The distinction is unknown to Ptolemy and does not satisfy the evidence.

ters of Book vii. After chapter 6 it has a list of provinces entitled *epitomé*, with rubrics as follows:

αἷδε εἰσὶν αἱ γνωθεῖς καὶ (sic) ἐπαρχίαι ἥτοι σατραπῖαι·  
 εὐρώπης μὲν ἐπαρχίαι λδ̄, πίνακες ῑ.  
 λιβύης δὲ ἐπαρχίαι ιβ̄, πίνακες δ̄.  
 ἀσίας μεγάλης ἐπαρχίαι μῃ, πίνακες ιβ̄.  
 ὁμοῦ γίνονται αἱ πᾶσα (sic) ἐπαρχίαι ζδ̄.

The provinces in the list tally with these numbers, 34 in Europe, 11 in Libya (Mauretania is omitted), 48 in Asia; and they thus inform us just how the total of 94 was reached. The ten provinces in excess of the 84 *periorismoi* are these: Dalmatia, Euboea (after Achaea), Numidia, three Egyptian nomes, Phrygia, Paphlagonia, Armenia Minor, Phoenicia. Moreover, Media and Susiana and Arabia Felix and Carmania are transposed. It should be noted also that the names of the British Isles and all the provinces of Asia are in the genitive, while the rest of Europe and Libya are in the accusative.

Codex X is of the thirteenth century, but the *epitomé* is found much earlier in a source outside the Ptolemaic tradition. Many MSS of Joannes Damascenus, *De fide orthodoxa*, have a number of geographical interpolations variously inserted in chapters 22–24, or, in one instance from the tenth century, added at the end. They are as follows:

a) περὶ ἀνέμων· ἀνεμοὶ δὲ πνέουσιν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς θερινῆς καικίας . . . κέρκιος ὑπὸ τῶν περιρικῶν ὀνομαζόμενος. εἰσὶν οὖν οἱ πάντες ιβ̄, ὧν ἡ διαγραφὴ ἐστὶν αὕτη, followed by a rose of winds (see Agathemerus 6–7 [*Geogr. Graec. min.*, II, 471–87]).

b) ἔθνη δὲ οἰκεῖ τὰ πέρατα . . . σάκες (see Agathemerus 7).

c) περὶ πελαγῶν· διαδέχεται τὸ αἰγαῖον πέλαγος . . . στάδια ιγ̄, θοβ̄ (see Agathemerus 9–10).

d) A list of provinces without title: εἰσὶ δὲ αἱ γνωθεῖσαι ἐπαρχίαι τῆς γῆς ἥτοι σατραπῖαι αὗται: εὐρώπης μὲν ἐπαρχίαι λδ̄, πίνακες ῑ, κτλ. just as in the *epitomé* in X, but with a longer subscription:

ὁμοῦ γίνονται  
 εὐρώπης μὲν πίνακες ῑ, ἐπαρχίαι λδ̄, πόλεις ἐπίσημοι ρῑ.  
 λιβύης δὲ πίνακες μὲν η̄, χῶραι ιβ̄, πόλεις ἐπίσημοι νβ̄.  
 ἀσίας δὲ μεγάλης πίνακες μὲν ιβ̄, ἐπαρχίαι δὲ μῃ, πόλεις ἐπίσημοι ρπ̄.  
 αἱ πᾶσαι τῆς οἰκουμένης χῶραι ζδ̄, πόλεις τν̄.

The list agrees closely with the *epitomé* in X in the order and names of the provinces, which are here numbered  $\bar{a}$ - $\lambda\delta$ ,  $\bar{a}$ - $\bar{\iota}\beta$ ,  $\bar{a}$ - $\bar{\mu}\eta$ . It gives the nominative forms, however, though there are traces of the accusative and genitive.<sup>7</sup>

The interpolations are not given in full in the editions of Joan. Damasc. (see Migne, *Patrologia graeca* XCIV, 900-909). The following information is drawn directly from the MSS. Coislin 374 (10th cent.) has *c d b* (om. *a*) together at the end of the work (fols. 307<sup>v</sup>-310<sup>v</sup>). Montfaucon (*Bibliotheca Coisliniana* [1715], pp. 581-84) publishes them in full from this MS. Bodleian Cromwell 13 (11th cent.) has *a* after chapter 22, *c* after 23, *d b* after 24. Paris. 1106 has *a b* after chapter 22, *c* after 23, omits *d*. Ambros. 274, Paris. 1111, 1116 give only *a* after 22, but the last has *b c* added on secondary leaves. Marc. 494, Ambros. 658, Paris. 1105, and Coislin. 375 do not have the interpolations at all.

There are also excerpts from Agathemerus and the Ptolemaic *epitomé* in the scholia on Dionysius Periegetes in Ambros. 886 (13th cent.) fol. 300<sup>v</sup>, Palat. 331 (14th cent.) fol. 1, *et al*:  $\pi\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\nu\ \epsilon\kappa\lambda\acute{\eta}\theta\eta\ \acute{\omega}\kappa\epsilon\alpha\nu\acute{o}\varsigma;\ \pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\acute{o}\ \acute{\omega}\kappa\epsilon\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\nu\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\lambda\omega\ \tau\acute{\eta}\nu\ \gamma\acute{\eta}\nu.$   $\epsilon\upsilon\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\eta\ \delta\epsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{o}\ \tau\acute{o}\upsilon\ \epsilon\upsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\omega}\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\eta.$   $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \delta\epsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{o}\ \tau\acute{o}\upsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\pi'\ \epsilon\upsilon\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\eta\varsigma\ \iota\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota.$   $\lambda\acute{\iota}\beta\eta\ \delta\epsilon\ \epsilon\upsilon\phi'\ \epsilon\lambda\lambda\acute{\eta}\nu\omega\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma.$   $\phi\omicron\iota\nu\iota\kappa\epsilon\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon\ \xi\eta\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{o}\ \tau\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \phi\omicron\iota\nu\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\sigma\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  (Agath. 4).  $\epsilon\upsilon\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\pi\alpha\rho\chi\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota\ \lambda\delta\ \pi\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\kappa\epsilon\varsigma\ \bar{\iota},\ \lambda\acute{\iota}\beta\eta\varsigma\ \epsilon\pi\alpha\rho\chi\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota\ \delta\acute{\omega}\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\ \pi\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\kappa\epsilon\varsigma\ \bar{\delta},\ \acute{\alpha}\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma\ \epsilon\pi\alpha\rho\chi\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota\ \bar{\mu}\theta\ \pi\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\kappa\epsilon\varsigma\ \delta\acute{\omega}\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha$  (Ptol. *épit.*).  $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\varsigma\ \pi\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\omicron\iota\ \epsilon\nu\ \pi\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\kappa\iota\ \tau\acute{\eta}\nu\ \omicron\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\nu\ \xi\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\alpha\nu;$   $\bar{\alpha}\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\zeta\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha\nu\delta\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\omicron}\ \mu\acute{\iota}\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\iota\omicron\varsigma,\ \bar{\beta}\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma,\ \bar{\gamma}\ \delta\eta\mu\acute{\omicron}\kappa\rho\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\omicron}\ \theta\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\ \mu\alpha\theta\eta\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma,\ \bar{\delta}\ \epsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron\zeta\omicron\varsigma.$   $\tau\acute{\eta}\nu\ \delta\epsilon\ \gamma\acute{\eta}\nu\ \omicron\acute{\iota}\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \sigma\tau\rho\omicron\gamma\gamma\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\eta\nu\ \xi\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\alpha\nu,$   $\delta\eta\mu\acute{\omicron}\kappa\rho\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon\ \pi\rho\omicron\mu\acute{\eta}\kappa\eta,\ \kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\varsigma\ \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\iota}\kappa\lambda\iota\omicron\nu,\ \acute{\iota}\pi\alpha\rho\chi\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\rho\alpha\pi\epsilon\zeta\omicron\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\eta,\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota\ \delta\epsilon\ \epsilon\upsilon\rho\omicron\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\eta,\ \pi\omicron\sigma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\omega}\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\omicron}\ \sigma\tau\omega\iota\kappa\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \sigma\phi\epsilon\delta\omicron\nu\omicron\sigma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\eta$  (Agath. 1-2). Eustathius (12th cent.) found these excerpts already among the scholia in his codex of Dionysius, for he quotes them in his own commentary. They were probably made originally by the same hand as the interpolations in Joan. Damasc. The little treatise of Agathemerus, from which they were taken, was preserved in only one MS, Palat. 398 (9th cent.) (see *Amer. Jour. Philol.* LVIII [1937], 177-79).

A list of provinces occurs also in the larger family of MSS of the *Geography* (Urb., Ser., C, V, etc.), immediately following viii. 3-28 and printed in the editions as viii. 29. This list differs considerably from the *epitomé* in X and the interpolations in Joan. Damasc., both in arrangement and in the names and number of the provinces. The names are in the nominative and are not numbered. The list is broken

<sup>7</sup> A very similar list is found in the B MSS (Fischer, *op. cit.*, pp. 164 f., 484 f.). The beginning of a similar list is interpolated in Codex V before *Geogr.* ii. 2:  $\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \epsilon\iota\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu\ \alpha\acute{\iota}\ \gamma\eta\nu\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\pi\alpha\rho\chi\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota\ \eta\eta\tau\omicron\iota\ \sigma\alpha\tau\rho\alpha\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota,$   $\epsilon\upsilon\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\eta\varsigma\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \lambda\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \tau\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\alpha\pi\epsilon\varsigma,$  followed by the first thirteen provinces with degrees of longitude and latitude, as in Nobbe, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

by rubrics for each of the 26 maps, *πίναξ πρῶτος*, *πίναξ δεύτερος*, etc. The headings and summaries are as follows:

αἶδε εἰσὶν αἱ γνωθεῖσαι ἐπαρχίαι ἡ σατραπῖαι τῆς οἰκουμένης·  
 εὐρώπης μὲν πίναξ πρῶτος, ἰουερνία νήσος, κτλ.  
 ὁμοῦ αἱ τῆς εὐρώπης ἐπαρχίαι λδ̄, πίνακες δέκα.  
 λιβύης δὲ, πίναξ πρῶτος, κτλ.  
 ὁμοῦ αἱ τῆς λιβύης ἐπαρχίαι ιβ̄, πίνακες δ̄.  
 ἀσίας μεγάλης ἡπείρου, πίναξ πρῶτος, κτλ.  
 ὁμοῦ καὶ αἱ τῆς ἀσίας ἐπαρχίαι μῇ, πίνακες δώδεκα.  
 ὥς γίνεσθαι τῆς ὅλης οἰκουμένης ἐπαρχίας ζδ̄, πίνακες κς̄.

There is an evident attempt to eliminate the discrepancies between the 84 true *periorismoi* and the 94 provinces of the *epitomé* by such entries as *ἀφρική ἐν ἧ καὶ νομηδία*. Dalmatia, Numidia, Phrygia, Paphlagonia, and Phoenicia are absorbed in this way. The other five false provinces remain. Susiana and Media and Carmania and Arabia Felix have been retransposed, and Euboea has been shifted after Crete at the end of Europe. But new disorders have been introduced. The island of Thule is added to the first map. Galatia and Pamphylia and Mesopotamia and Arabia Deserta are transposed. These changes have thrown the list out of joint with its own summaries without bringing it into harmony with the *periorismoi*.

Still another list of provinces is found in the synopses, or tables of contents, for Books ii-vii. One would expect these to be compiled from the *thesis* titles of the *periorismoi* in these books, but this is not the case. The synopses share the false features of the other lists of provinces just discussed and are in fact another such list cut into pieces to fit the respective books. This list is intermediate between the *epitomé* and viii. 29. The number and order of the provinces agree with the *epitomé* except that Euboea is listed after Crete, Thebais is combined with Egypt, and Phoenicia with Syria. The names are in the genitive in ii (western Europe) and v-vii (Asia), but in the accusative in iii-iv (eastern Europe and Libya). An isolated accusative occurs in Book ii also (*ἰσπανίαν τὴν λουσιτανίαν*). But the verbal form of the names is often different from the *epitomé* (*κελτογαλατίας v. γαλλίαν*, etc.) and there are rubrics for the maps in ii-iv as in viii. 29. Synopses ii-iv have summaries:

- II. ἐπαρχίαι ιε πίνakes ε̄. om. N, C, and V, ις Urb.  
 III. ἐπαρχίαι ιζ πίνakes ε̄. om. Urb., δέκα ἔξ N, ις C and V.  
 IV. ἐπαρχίαι ι πίνakes δ̄. om. Urb., ια N, C, and V.

The inconstancy of the numbers is similar to that already found in the synopsis for Book viii (p. 233).

Four lists of Ptolemaic provinces have been described in the preceding paragraphs: the *epitomé* in X, the interpolation in Joan. Damasc.; viii. 29 in Urb., Ser., C, and V; and the synopses for Books ii-vii. All share common features at odds with the genuine *periorismoi* of the text (ii. 2-vii. 4) and the maps. Probably, therefore, they are all the work of some interpolator. They seem to be connected especially with viii. 3-28, which already contain some of the false features. It remains to consider the age of the lists. They are found in X as well as in Urb., Ser., N, C, and V and hence go back to the uncial period before the ninth century. Still earlier evidence is found in the synopsis of Book ii, which has a remarkable series of numbers at the right, opposite the names of the provinces, e.g.,

ιοερνίας νήσου βρεττανικῆς, πίναξ πρῶτος, ᾱ σελ., ος̄.  
 ἰλλυρίδος λιβουρνίας ρ̄λᾱ.

The series is imperfectly preserved, but traces of it are found in Urb., Ser., N, C, and V (see Cuntz, *op. cit.*, p. 6). The numbers doubtless refer to pages (*selides*) of some archetype, which were equivalent to two-thirds of a column in Urb., or about 35 lines. Numbering of pages was common in rolls and codices during the early centuries of the Christian Era, but not in medieval codices.<sup>8</sup> Still earlier evidence is found in Ammianus Marcellinus (ca. A.D. 380), who cites Ptolemy by name and drew upon his *Geography* (Fischer, *op. cit.*, pp. 483-87). In xxxiii. 6 he gives a list of Persian satrapies that agrees with the synopsis of Ptol. *Geogr.* Book vi. The compilation and interpolation of these lists of Ptolemaic provinces and satrapies is thus carried back to the fourth century.

#### INDIANA UNIVERSITY

<sup>8</sup> Fischer (*op. cit.*, pp. 175-78 and 517) was advised by Mercati and Bick that these page numbers probably belonged to a copy of the *Geography* in papyrus rolls of Egyptian provenance. However, similar page numbers are found in codices of papyrus and parchment outside of Egypt, e.g., Brit. Mus. add. MS 34473 (Demosthenes, parchment, 1st or 2d cent.). See H. A. Sanders in the *University of Michigan Quarterly Review*, 1938, p. 110.



## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

### NOTES ON DIOCLETIAN'S *EDICT*<sup>1</sup>

To most of us F. F. Abbott's essay on the *Edict*, with his partial translation of it, forms the chief contact with this extremely important and often quoted document. Waddington gives a paraphrase rather than a translation of the Introduction; Blümner gives a complete explanation of the tables but makes no attempt to translate the Introduction; Grenier translates part of the Introduction and comments on one section of the tables.

Abbott says the *Edict* "contains a diatribe against the high cost of living and records the heroic attempt which the Roman government made to reduce it." Rostovtzeff, in his *Social and Economic History*, dismisses the *Edict* with hardly a word, which is difficult to understand in view of his emphasis on the influence of the army in determining the course of social and economic development in the troubled times of the third century.

Was the *Edict* concerned primarily with the general high cost of living? While the Introduction has much to say about profiteering, that Introduction and the tables of maximum prices taken together indicate that Diocletian's chief concern was not so much the general high cost of the necessities of life as it was the high cost of supplying the armies and, though it is not mentioned, the civil service bureaucracy.

There is the well-known passage in the Introduction:

Who does not know the boldness which is traitor to the common weal, that wherever the security of all demands that our armies be sent, not only in towns and villages but on every road, profiteering becomes open and the prices of goods go up not only fourfold or eightfold but so far that the human tongue is incapable of expression; in short, does anyone think that by this cause the soldier should be robbed of his pay and of our gifts, and that the common effort of the whole world to support our armies should yield to those detestable robbers? So that the army seems to contribute its food allowance and the soldiers the result of their labors to these robbers of all, by as much as these robbers of the state itself think they may steal each day.

<sup>1</sup> The modern works referred to by name in this paper are F. F. Abbott, *The Common People of Ancient Rome*; Waddington, *Edit de Dioclétien, établissant le maximum dans l'empire romain ...* (Paris, 1864); *Der maximal Tarif des Diocletians*, ed. Mommsen-Blümner; A. Grenier, "La Gaule romaine," in *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, ed. T. Frank, Vol. III (Baltimore, 1937); R. G. Collingwood, "Roman Britain," in *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, ed. T. Frank, Vol. III (Baltimore, 1937); M. Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (1926). In 1826 W. M. Leake published a translation of the tables, but not of the Introduction, in a pamphlet, *An Edict of Diocletian Fixing a Maximum of Prices throughout the Roman Empire* (1826).

In addition, there are numerous indications in the tables.

vii.	33	polisher of old saber
	34	for polishing old metal helmet
	37	for polishing sheath
ix.	6	military boots
	11	soldier's shoes
x.	2	military saddle
	8	military girdle
	9	military girdle (another width)
xiv.	4	spear shaft
	5	pike (?) shaft
xix.	1	military mantle
xxvi.	28	soldier's smock, best quality
	29	soldier's smock, second quality
	30	soldier's smock, third quality

An analysis by lines of the contents of the tables shows some interesting facts. The figures represent the total number of lines in the *Edict* in which articles of the classes mentioned are found.

#### A. PRICES OF GOODS

	No. of Lines		No. of Lines
1. Foodstuffs		Tools and implements...	33
Vegetable products.....	126	Metals.....	1
Meats and fowl.....	55	Forage.....	3
Fish.....	14	Other.....	36
Wine.....	20		
Other.....	9		
2. Wearing apparel, etc.		B. WAGES	
Linens.....	248	Gold workers.....	6
Woolens.....	74	Industrial activities.....	15
Purple silk and wool.....	12	Textile.....	44
Silk.....	1	Fullers.....	26
Goat and camel hair.....	8	Transportation activities.....	10
Shoes.....	21	Building activities.....	13
Hides and skins.....	43	Agricultural activities.....	4
Leather saddlery, etc....	19	Food preparation.....	1
3. Other		Educational services.....	8
Timber, firewood, etc....	23	Legal.....	2
Wagons and wagon parts.	42	Personal services.....	6
		Other.....	3

The list can be said to be complete in two categories only: food and clothing. The great detail shown, particularly in the tables on linen and woolen products, makes it tempting to infer that these lists were drawn up by or for managers of state-operated establishments rather than that they were intended to control the operations of small owner-operated shops.

The list of tools and implements is curious, including as it does shoemakers' lasts, weaving shuttles, combs and spindles, knives for scaling fish and smooth-

ing leather, mallets, winnowing shovels, wooden forks, wooden measures, mill-stones and sieves—certainly not a list that would satisfy domestic needs in town or country.

Even admitting that our list as preserved is incomplete, it can hardly be argued that it is one fairly representative of ordinary activity. How can the hay in units of two pounds or green forage in units of six pounds be explained (xvii. 6, 8)?

That the list of articles mentioned in the tables was not one intended for the mass of the population is much more strikingly shown by a comparison of wages and the cost of wearing apparel. The highest paid workman mentioned by Diocletian, a figure-painter (vii. 9), received 150 denarii a day and his keep. Sections 19, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29 of the tables list 285 items of wearing apparel. Of these, only 18 could be bought for one day's labor or less by this highly paid painter. The number of days' pay necessary for this man to buy the other items in the sections just mentioned is as follows:

No. of Days' Pay	No. of Items
1-2 .....	21
3-5 .....	43
6-10 .....	45
11-15 .....	35
16-20 .....	27
21-30 .....	25
31-40 .....	24
41-50 .....	11
51-60 .....	12
61-90 .....	14
91-120 .....	1
121-200 .....	3
Over 200 .....	6

Of this last group, one item would cost the workman a thousand days' labor.

This may be shown in another way. In sections 19, 26 (l. 13 to end), 27, 28, and 29 there are 255 articles with prices. The average price of these 255 articles is 3,370 denarii. In other words, it would take twenty-two days' labor by this figure-painter to purchase the average piece of wearing apparel listed.

It is impossible, apparently, to compare the prices of foodstuffs as given in the *Edict* with wages. If we take the wage paid unskilled labor—25 denarii a day and keep (vii. 1)—we have a wage seemingly equivalent to  $7\frac{1}{2}$  artabae of wheat a month, leaving the "keep" altogether out of the calculation. If we consider the amount of wheat in a contract of the year A.D. 605, in which a man agrees to work for two years at a total wage of 19 artabae as the least amount necessary to support life, and add this to the  $7\frac{1}{2}$  artabae, we have a wage equivalent to  $8\frac{1}{4}$  artabae a month. This is about four times the amount earned by contemporary common labor in Egypt. It is interesting to recall that this ratio is in close accord with the ratio of the wages of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  and 12 asses

earned in Egypt and Italy, respectively, in the time of Augustus. If any inference can be drawn from the calculation just made, it is that the wage scale of the *Edict* was intended to reflect conditions in Europe rather than in Egypt, Palestine, or Syria.

Was the *Edict* intended for the whole empire? Several points indicate its general application. Of little significance is the fact that it was issued jointly by the four rulers. More important are several statements in the Introduction itself: "However difficult it may be to lay bare the world-wide raging greed"; "We have determined to regulate not prices—for that may not justly be done, since many provinces pride themselves on their cheapness of price and abundance of goods"; "It is our pleasure, therefore, that those prices which the subjoined written summary specifies be held in observance throughout all our domain"; "We request, therefore, the help of all that this law . . . may be observed with fitting respect and due care, especially since it is made not for single states or peoples or provinces, but for the whole world."

These statements do not change the fact, however, that so far fragments of the document have been found only in the East, or the fact that the majority of items mentioned in connection with a place of origin are from the East. Arranged according to provinces, the list of such items is as shown in Table 1. As will be readily seen, almost every part of the empire is represented in this table, even though some of the geographical terms were undoubtedly trade names—for example, Babylonian hides—rather than indications of the place of origin.

If the *Edict* was intended primarily for the East, one must assume that there was substantial export from western Europe to the eastern part of the Mediterranean, or else a wholesale imitation in the East of Western products. It is curious that, of a total of 19 articles of food in this list, 13 came from the Latin-speaking half of the empire, and that every named wine came from Italy. Of 69 references to named woolen products, 35 are to the Latin-speaking half of the empire.

A good example of the inferences that may be drawn from these named articles in the *Edict* is furnished by Collingwood:

The only certain evidence of exports from Britain in the fourth century relates to cloth, British woolen cloaks being mentioned in Diocletian's *Edict of Prices* as an article of commerce in the Eastern Empire. The fact is significant as showing that by this time Britain, instead of merely exporting raw materials, as in the time of Strabo, had now developed one industry of her own which made itself felt all over the markets of the Empire. . . .

This statement rests on the unproved assumption that the *Edict* was intended only for the East. If, however, as the weight of evidence indicates, the *Edict* had general application, then the only inference that can safely be drawn from these named articles is that they were well known in the region where they were made. Perhaps some were exported, but the relatively very high prices of the articles of wearing apparel and the indications in the tables that

TABLE 1

	Food	Woolens	Linens	Leather	Drugs	Miscellaneous
A. Latin Europe and Africa						
Spain . . . . .		1				
Asturia . . . . .		1				
Cerritani . . . . .	1					
Gaul . . . . .		3	3	3		
Nervii . . . . .		2				
Treveri . . . . .		1				
Ambiani . . . . .		1				
Bituriges . . . . .		1				
Atrebates . . . . .		1				
Germany . . . . .						
Menapii . . . . .	1					
Italy . . . . .	4					
Picenum . . . . .	1					
Latium . . . . .	2					
Sabines . . . . .	1					
Campania . . . . .	1					
Marsi . . . . .	1					
Mutina . . . . .		4				
Baleso . . . . .		1				
Canusium . . . . .		1				
Tarentum . . . . .		2				
Britain . . . . .		1				
Dacia . . . . .		2				
Noricum . . . . .		4				
Rhaetia . . . . .		1				
Pannonia . . . . .						
Pettau . . . . .		1				
Moesia . . . . .						
Dardania . . . . .		1				
Africa . . . . .	1	4				
Numidia . . . . .		2				
B. Greek-speaking East						
Thrace . . . . .						
Bessus . . . . .		1				
Greece . . . . .						
Achaia . . . . .		2				
Argolis . . . . .		1				
Islands . . . . .						
Cyprus . . . . .			1			
Paphos . . . . .						2

TABLE 1—*Continued*

	Food	Woolens	Linens	Leather	Drugs	Miscellaneous
B. Greek-speaking East— <i>Continued</i>						
Asia Minor.....						
Maeonia.....	1					
Caria.....	2					
Tralles.....			1	1		
Laodicea.....		10				
Miletus.....		1				
Magnesia.....		1				
Phrygia.....		2				
Nicaea.....						1
Tarsus.....			52			
Cappadocia.....		2				
Pontus.....		2				
Arabia.....						
Damascus.....	2	1	1			
Syria.....						
Byblos.....			27			
Laodicea.....			26			
Palestine.....						
Scythopolis.....			27			
Egypt.....	1	1				
Antinoopolis.....			1			
C. Outside of Empire						
Babylonia.....				6		
China.....						1
India.....					4	
South Arabia.....					2	

many were made to order rather than carried in stock is evidence against this. Diocletian himself, near the end of the Introduction, expresses opposition to the carrying of goods from one place to another and tries to make such traffic unprofitable. Whether the *Edict* was intended for general application, or was intended for the East only, those who favor the idea that the mention of an article in connection with a distinguishing geographical name indicates export of that article must, it seems, claim that such articles were widely distributed and should at least be found in the places where the extant fragments of the *Edict* have been found. Yet some of those places were comparatively unimportant, with no probable demand that would justify merchants in carrying anything like a full line of such articles.

The turmoil of the two preceding generations had made trade between provinces, except for government supplies, difficult and hazardous. There are no particular difficulties if one assumes that the *Edict*, attempting to set a series of maximum prices for the empire, combined in one list things well known in different places and that, for example, the mention of woollens made in Britain, Spain, Gaul, Italy, Dacia, Noricum, and Africa only means that those articles were well known in those particular places. In the heyday of Roman prosperity all things were to be found in Rome, but that at the opening of the fourth century they should be found as commercial articles in small provincial towns in the East is not plausible or reasonable.

Even when one keeps in mind the fact that the *Edict* only set maximum prices above which articles and services could not be sold, some of its omissions are interesting:

a) There is no distinction between retail and wholesale prices. The obvious explanation is that the *Edict* considers retail prices solely. It also implies that the great bulk of articles listed were sold directly by the grower or maker and in many instances were clearly articles made on individual order.

b) There is no allowance for transportation charges. If Italian wine was exported, the cost in Rome, London, and Antioch could not fairly be the same. Diocletian's answer to this, "since it has been justly decided that they who transport goods may not sell more dearly," is not one that works in practice.

c) There is no mention of the common metals. It is curious that over two hundred linen articles are mentioned and no household utensils of metal.

d) There is no mention of tableware and kitchenware, of pottery or glass.

e) There is no mention of the common domestic animals. Even in the fairly complete list of foodstuffs, pepper is missing.

Too much weight obviously cannot be put on omissions in a text compiled from many fragments; but, in view of what we do have, some of these omissions are noteworthy.

In papyri dated in the reign of Diocletian there seem to be only two published prices that may be compared with those in the *Edict*. P. Oxyrh. 2142 mentions wheat at 300 drachmae per artaba, while P. Oxyrh. 2144 mentions Macedonian petroselinum at 800 drachmae an ounce. The *Edict* gives wheat at 100 denarii per artaba and petroselinum at 170 denarii a pound. In the last case the difference is enormous.

CLEVELAND, OHIO

LOUIS C. WEST

#### CRETICS IN THE FIRST SCENE OF PLAUTUS' *EPIDICUS*

Some months ago I discussed in this *Journal* two passages in the first scene of the *Epidicus*, which on the metrical side have caused considerable difficulty to editors of Plautus.<sup>1</sup> I have for some time been engaged upon a

<sup>1</sup> "The Verse Structure of *Epidicus* 25-26," *Class. Phil.*, XXXII (1937), 63-67.



critical edition of the *Epidicus*,<sup>2</sup> and my investigations of the meter of the first scene led me to the belief that 25-26 and probably 57-58 were composed of two cretics followed by a sequence of twelve iambic feet. This theory brought the two passages in line with Crusius' scansion of 9-10 and 29-30<sup>3</sup> and seemed to clarify to some extent the structure of the *canticum*. It is perhaps impossible to achieve certainty on metrical problems where there has been such general disagreement, and recently Otto Skutsch has raised a friendly objection to my scansion of 25-26, although he accepts essentially the explanation of 57-58 as cretics and iambs.<sup>4</sup> In view of this difference of opinion and because of certain additional points which he has raised, a few supplementary remarks will perhaps be in order.

Skutsch criticizes the scansion of 25-26 on the following grounds: (1) the clash of ictus and accent in a cretic such as *ius dicis* is usually avoided; (2) the iambs *iam tu autem nobis praetura* are "mere spondaics"; (3) it is more likely that A omitted *hominem* than that P added it; and (4) it is unwise to argue from the similarity of 25-26 to 9-10 and 29-30, for Crusius' analysis of these two passages is open to question. This is an imposing array of arguments, but upon examination their value appears less conclusive.

The first point is an important one, and yet, as Skutsch himself admits, there are instances in cretics of such a clash in the spondaic word (e.g., in *Epid.* 330: *is nummum*; 544: *anni multi*). The second point is of little value since Skutsch later scans these same lines as iambic and says, "The first of the two iambic octonarii is faultless,"<sup>5</sup> although the spondaics are still present. The strength of the third argument depends upon one's opinion of the relative worth of A and P. It is, of course, possible that the reading in A is the result of haplographic omission. The *hominem* of P, however, is not only unnecessary but has been criticized by scholars, who have as a result frequently emended the verse.<sup>6</sup> The line arrangement of A, though far from faultless, should be a useful guide to the metrical analysis of the scene, and the scansion of 25-26 as cretics and iambs seems the most satisfactory approximation to the curious division into four lines which is found in A.<sup>7</sup> It seems advisable, in keeping as close as possible to the colometry of A, to follow also

<sup>2</sup> This edition will present a new collation of the principal MSS and will have a commentary in which will be discussed problems of text, meter, and interpretation. The late Professor Arthur L. Wheeler had planned the edition and begun the collation of the MSS. Upon his sudden death in 1932 the work was intrusted to me. I accept full responsibility for the metrical theories which I have expressed here and elsewhere.

<sup>3</sup> F. Crusius, *Die Responsion in den plautinischen Cantica* (Leipzig, 1929) (= *Philol.*, Suppl. XXI, Heft 1), pp. 102 f.

<sup>4</sup> "The First Scene of Plautus' *Epidicus*," *Class. Phil.*, XXXII (1937), 360-65.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 363.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Duckworth, *op. cit.*, p. 63, n. 2.

<sup>7</sup> It is misleading for Skutsch to print my arrangement with the two cretics on the same line. I believe that originally the cretics were written as monometers (as is the case with 85, 87, 89, 92, 94, 96, and 98 in A), but that both in 25 and in 9 part of the first cretic was wrongly added to the second through some error.

the text of A when that text permits a scansion which is both intelligible and is found elsewhere in the scene. The attempt of Skutsch to explain the colometry of A by using the text of P results in the curious and unsatisfactory arrangement of two iambic octonarii with the first word of each detached, so that the verses appear to be trochaic septenarii. This is a far cry from the division of these verses in A.

Furthermore, and this brings us to the fourth point, Skutsch does not deny that both 9 and 29 contain cretics, however much he may differ from Crusius on the subject of the iambic sequence. The similar arrangement in A of 9 and 25 would certainly imply that there is a similarity of meter; therefore, if we have cretics in 9, which, as Skutsch admits, are supported by the arrangement in A, then we have a strong argument for the presence of cretics in 25. The evidence of A for 25-26 is twofold; the arrangement of the lines and the omission of *hominem* combine to make more plausible the scansion of the passage as cretics and iambs. Leaving aside for the moment a further consideration of Crusius' analysis, the presence of cretics and iambs in 57-58, which I suggested as a possibility<sup>8</sup> and which Skutsch accepts,<sup>9</sup> gives additional support to my theory concerning 25-26.

If Crusius is correct, we have two additional instances of cretics and iambs, 9-10 and 29-30. Skutsch, however, believes that in 29-30 the cretics are followed by an iambic dimeter and a trochaic septenarius. While this is possible, it is worth noting that both in 52-53 and in 65-66,<sup>10</sup> where the cretics are followed by a short line and a trochaic septenarius, the short line is also trochaic. But in 29 the short line is clearly iambic; should therefore the long line which follows be trochaic? Skutsch says that *pol illa ad hostes*, etc., must be scanned as trochaic, i.e., *pól illa*; when the pronoun is emphatic, the first syllable retains its quantity, e.g., *Men. 746: si me derides, dī pol illum non potes*. For this very reason I should be inclined to keep the scansion

<sup>8</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 66-67. I still feel that the arguments for this scansion in 57-58 are weaker than for 25-26.

<sup>9</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 362. His scansion of 57-58 as two cretics and an additional short line (iambic dimeter) followed by an iambic octonarius is essentially the same as my sequence of twelve iambic feet. It is not without interest that 59-60 likewise form a sequence of twelve iambic feet. I follow Leo, Goetz, and Lindsay in printing these verses as a dimeter followed by an octonarius, on the authority of A. Crusius (*op. cit.*, p. 103) wrongly scans 59-60 as trochaic and considers it part of a trochaic system beginning with 58 (cf. Duckworth, *op. cit.*, p. 66).

<sup>10</sup> The scansion of 52 as two cretics followed by a trochaic dimeter catalectic has been generally accepted with the reading *quid igitur*. For earlier conjectures see Ussing, *ad. loc.*, Goetz (2d ed.), Appen., pp. 105 f. Crusius, however (*op. cit.*, p. 103), scans 52 as an iambic dimeter catalectic followed by a cretic dimeter. I am pleased that Skutsch (*op. cit.*, p. 362) scans 65 also as two cretics and a trochaic dimeter catalectic. This was the scansion of Kiessling (quoted by Goetz, *op. cit.*, p. 106), Havet ("Observations sur Plaute," *Rev. phil.*, XXXII [1908], 11), and Lindström (*Commentarii Plautini* [Uppsala, 1907], p. 97) but most editors, as Skutsch points out, have followed the *detegetur* of P rather than the testimony of Nonius.

*pol illa*; for the emphasis is upon the armor which fled to the enemy. I see no reason, therefore, for rejecting Crusius' scansion of 29-30.

Thus far we have two groups of cretics: those in 25, 29, and 57, which are apparently followed by iambs (a short and a longer line which together equal a sequence of twelve feet), and the cretics in 52 and 65 which precede two trochaic lines (likewise a short followed by a long line). Crusius, as we have seen, adds 9-10 to the cretic-iambic passages. Most editors have scanned 9 as an iambic septenarius.<sup>11</sup> Skutsch accepts Crusius' belief that we have cretics in 9, but he introduces a change of speaker after the first cretic, and prints as follows:

EP.: quid tu agis? TH.: ut uales?

EP.: exemplum ades[se]. TH.: intellego. EP.: eugae.

The second line becomes a trochaic dimeter acatalectic or, if *adesse* be retained, an iambic dimeter with *eugae* as *extra metrum*. Skutsch admits that there is here "a certain ambiguity as to the detail."

Since this theory of 9 marks a somewhat radical departure in several respects from the usual reading, it will be profitable to examine the passage with care. In the first place, Skutsch points out that in 29, 52, 57, and 65 (and also in 98, where Epidicus is talking to a fictitious interlocutor) the cretics are divided between the two speakers and therefore the introduction of a change of speakers in the cretics in 9 makes this line fall in with the others. It is true that the division of the cretics between two speakers adds to the vivacity of the dialogue, but that is no reason for arbitrarily introducing such a division. In Plautus' use of cretic dimeters elsewhere there are almost no instances of a change of speaker between the cretics.<sup>12</sup>

A more serious objection arises from the fact that in Plautus the expression *quid agis? ut uales?* is a formula of greeting which, like similar double questions (e.g., *quid agis? quid fit?*), is invariably spoken by one person and usually answered by the next speaker. To have Thesprio ignore Epidicus' question and ask a similar question is undoubtedly a violation of Plautus' normal procedure.

Furthermore, Skutsch's interpretation of the passage is far from clear. Not only does Thesprio ignore Epidicus' question, but Epidicus, ignoring likewise the question of Thesprio, answers his own question by saying *exemplum ades*. Thesprio then says *intellego*, which Skutsch understands as equiva-

<sup>11</sup> E.g., Leo, Goetz (2d ed.), Goetz-Schoell, and Ammendola; cf. also H. Drexler, *Plautinische Akzentstudien* (Breslau, 1932), II, 297. Lindsay scans 9 as trochaic, as does Havet, *op. cit.*, pp. 5 ff.

<sup>12</sup> With the exception of the instances in this scene I find only *Most.* 342 (*unde agis te? CA.: unde homo, etc.*) and *Truc.* 118 (*si esse uis. DI.: faxo erunt. CAS.* 213, *Most.* 339, 729, and *Truc.* 123 are not parallel. For an example of a change of speaker in longer cretic lines cf. *Pers.* 17: *ut uales? TO.: ut queo. SAG.: quid agitur? TO.: uiuitur*. It is perhaps worth noting that in *Epid.* 25, where Skutsch denies the existence of cretics, there is a change of speaker between *ius dicis* and *me decet*. But such a change of speaker does not in itself prove the cretic scansion to be the correct one.

lent to *nempe hoc dicis*, a reference to Thesprio's well-rounded stomach or to his *marsupium*; then Epidicus utters an admiring *eugae*. The whole connection of the thought seems disjointed, and Skutsch forces from the Latin a meaning which it can hardly have. Certainly the arrangement of the speakers in Goetz is more satisfactory: Ep.: *quid tu agis? ut uales?* Th.: *exemplum adesse*—Ep.: *intellego. eugae*, etc.<sup>13</sup> After the usual greeting from Epidicus, Thesprio begins his reply: "You see present a model of health," but Epidicus interrupts with the words: *intellego. eugae! corpulentior uidere atque habitior*.

Finally there are two metrical arguments which militate against the correctness of Skutsch's assumption. The cretics already discussed have been followed either by an iambic dimeter or by a lecythion (trochaic dimeter catalectic). Skutsch finds here a trochaic dimeter acatalectic which appears nowhere else in this scene and which is very uncommon in Plautus. In the second place, Skutsch again ignores Crusius' theory of the metrical similarity of 7-11 and 27-31. The fact that 7-8 and 11 have the same meter as 27-28 and 31 provides a strong argument for the similarity of 9-10 and 29-30, especially since the presence of cretics in both 9 and 29 is not denied. Skutsch has not succeeded, it seems to me, in disproving the scansion of the passage as cretics followed by iambs.

On the main point, however, that there exists in the first part of the scene a larger number of cretics than has previously been believed, Skutsch and I are in essential agreement. While Goetz, for example, scanned only 52 as a cretic dimeter,<sup>14</sup> it now seems evident that we have cretic dimeters (which I should prefer to print as monometers on separate lines) in 9, 29, 57, and 65. To these I add 25, *pace* Skutsch. It will perhaps be impossible ever to reach complete agreement on points of detail. Nevertheless, it is to be hoped that much of the confusion which previously existed concerning these verses has now been cleared away.

I wish to turn briefly to two more passages which should be mentioned in this connection. In 73-76 we have four lines which are usually scanned as four trochaic dimeters catalectic or as two trochaic dimeters catalectic followed by two cretic dimeters.<sup>15</sup> Since A gives five lines to these four verses, I believe that Lindsay's suggestion should be adopted and that 75 should be printed as two cretic monometers. But that 76 is a cretic dimeter seems most unlikely; *quo tu intere-* is an unusually awkward cretic foot. Scholars, misled

<sup>13</sup> While following Goetz's assignment of speakers, I prefer to retain the *adesse* of the MSS. Epidicus interrupts Thesprio as in 8. *Eugae* usually follows directly on the words of another (cf. H. Weber, "Plautusstudien," *Philol.*, LVII [1898], 243 f.), but not always; cf. *Most.* 260, 311; *Pers.* 90; *Poen.* 576; *Pseud.* 692; *Trin.* 705.

<sup>14</sup> I am excluding from the present discussion the system of cretics and trochaics which begins at 85.

<sup>15</sup> Leo, Goetz-Schoell, Lindsay, Ammendola, and Ernout scan 75-76 as cretic dimeters, Ussing, Gray, and Goetz as trochaic dimeters catalectic. The scansion of 75-76 as anapaestic-iambic tripodies (Havet, *op. cit.*, p. 14) or as an iambic senarius (Crusius, *op. cit.*, p. 104) seems highly improbable, as does Drexler's scansion of 75 as an iambic dimeter (*op. cit.*, II, 12).

by their belief that 75 and 76 have the same meter, have neglected the evidence of A. It seems very probable that 75-76 are two cretic monometers followed by a trochaic dimeter catalectic as in 52 and 65. It should be noted that here too the long line which follows is a trochaic septenarius.

In 67-68 we have a passage which has long been the despair of editors<sup>16</sup> and which will perhaps never be satisfactorily explained. Skutsch, by exchanging two words, reaches the following solution:

mitte nunciam  
nam ille me domum  
uetuit uenire, ad Chaeribulum iussit huc in proximum.

This is a more satisfactory explanation than that of Lindsay, but still leaves something to be desired. In the first place, the two short verses (cretic cola, or, to be more exact, trochaic tripodies catalectic) are found nowhere else in this scene and are used by Plautus most frequently to close a verse beginning with cretic dimeters.<sup>17</sup> Second, the arrangement of Skutsch does not explain the line divisions in A. Lindsay in his apparatus suggested that *mitte nunciam* possibly made two verses, but the four-line arrangement which he prints in the Oxford text wrongly divides 68, which in A forms one long verse. I prefer to follow the suggestion of Kiessling<sup>18</sup> that we have here two cretics followed by a trochaic dimeter catalectic. Line 67 would then be similar to 52, 65, and 75-76. The long line which follows 67, although we should expect a trochaic septenarius, is apparently an iambic verse of seven feet.<sup>19</sup> The two verses have then this form:

mitte (me)  
nunciam  
nam ille me uetuit domum  
uenire: ad Chaeribulum iussit huc in proximum.

This arrangement keeps the word order of the MSS and accounts for the division into four lines which we find in A. It is necessary, however, to supply *me* after *mitte*. Goetz (1st ed.), Ussing, and Gray accepted the emendation of Camerarius (*mitte nunciam me*), but scanned 67 as a trochaic octonarius; other editors follow the MSS and omit *me*.<sup>20</sup> Goetz (2d ed.) indicates after

<sup>16</sup> Both 67 and 68 are marked as *incerti* by Goetz-Schoell, Ammendola, and Ernout.

<sup>17</sup> Skutsch's arrangement of the short verses is similar to that of Havet (*op. cit.*, p. 13), who kept the traditional word order but in his second line read *uetat* for *uetuit*, and began his third line with *domum*. For the scansion of 67 as a cretic colon followed by trochaics cf. Leo, *Die plautinischen Cantica und die hellenistische Lyrik* (Berlin, 1897) (= *Abhandl. der Gesellschaft der Wissensch. zu Göttingen*, I, 7), pp. 10 f.; see also S. Sudhaus, *Der Aufbau der plautinischen Cantica* (Leipzig, 1909), p. 148.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Goetz (2d ed.), Appen., p. 107.

<sup>19</sup> An iambic tripod plus a dimeter? Cf. Leo, *ad. loc.* If we could assume the loss of a monosyllable (e.g., *tum*) at the beginning of 68, the line would be an excellent trochaic septenarius. But the line in A clearly begins with *uenire*.

<sup>20</sup> For other attempts to emend and scan 67-68 cf. R. Mueller, *De Plauti Epidico* (Bonn, 1865), p. 34; T. Hasper, *Ad Epidicum Plautinum coniectanea* (Dresden, 1882),

*nunciam* a lacuna of one line, but the thought of the passage seems complete. Although *mitte* is frequently used without an object (cf. *Asin.* 596; *Men.* 1013, 1016; *Mil. gl.* 444, 449, 1424; *Poen.* 336; *Pseud.* 1186), the expression *mitte me, mitte istunc* is equally common (cf. *Epid.* 72; *mitte me, ut eam nunciam*; *Cas.* 231; *Curc.* 151, 633, 702; *Men.* 1000, 1007; *Most.* 1172; *Pseud.* 239<sup>a</sup>; *Truc.* 912), and Thesprio's desire to depart (cf. 63 f., 72), marking as it does a change in the thought from 66, seems abruptly stated unless *me* is supplied.

I am not satisfied that my explanation of 67-68 is the correct one; it seems preferable, however, to the scansion of 67 as trochaic tripodies catalectic—a scansion which introduces into the scene a decidedly alien note. Cretic monometers followed by a trochaic dimeter catalectic seem not only to harmonize with the nature of this *canticum* but best account for the line divisions of A. I would suggest, by way of summary, that cretics followed by iambs appear in 9, 25, 29, and 57; cretics followed by trochaics in 52, 65, 75-76, and possibly in 67. The cretic nature of the scene thus appears throughout the *canticum* and reaches its climax in the conclusion, the monody of Epidicius, which falls into three parts: (i) four trochaic septenarii (81-84); (ii) eight pairs of cretic monometers alternating with trochaic septenarii (85-99); and (iii) again four trochaic septenarii (100-103).

GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

---

*S.V.B.E.*

The Roman orator of earlier Republican times began a speech with an invocation of the gods, a practice which had died out by the time of Cicero (cf. Servius on Virg. *Aen.* xi. 301). A similar fate overcame the pleasant custom of beginning a letter with such a conventional greeting as “*si vales, bene est, ego valeo.*” Seneca (*Ep.* 15) notes its disappearance, and so does Pliny (*Ep.* i. 11), with some appearance of regret (“*hoc mihi sufficit, est enim maximum*”). Since these conventional formulas vary to some extent, it is not without interest to consider the evidence supplied from Cicero's correspondence.

A conventional formula occurs at the beginning of only thirty-four letters of the extant correspondence, a fact which in itself indicates that the convention was rapidly being disregarded. Such a formula prefaces sixteen of Cicero's own letters, ten of these being written to his wife Terentia, and one to his family. It never prefaces the letters to Atticus or Tiro, the correspondents to whom he wrote most openly, or, in fact, any letter written to men whom Cicero knew intimately, as Tyrrell and Purser remarked (see note on *Fam.* v. 7 and *Att.* ii. 9).

p. 13; F. Nencini, “Emendazioni Plautine,” *St. ital. fil. class.*, III (1895), 92; V. C. Lindström, “De trochaeis apud Plautum continuis . . . quaestio metrica,” *Strena philologica Upsaliensis. Festschrift Per Persson* (Upsala, 1922), p. 323; Crusius, *op. cit.*, p. 104.



Seneca (*Ep.* 15) cites the short formula, *si vales, bene est*, which appears in the Ciceronian correspondence either in full (*Fam.* v. 1, xiv. 15 [a letter to Terentia]) or as *s.v.b.* (*Fam.* vii. 29, xi. 3, xii. 16, xv. 19) or *s.v.b.e.* (in two copies of letters, viz. *Att.* viii. 11C, ix. 7B). Pliny quotes the longer form: "*si vales, bene est, ego valeo*"; and this appears in the Ciceronian correspondence as *s.v.b.e.v.* (*Fam.* v. 14, xii. 13,<sup>1</sup> xiii. 6 and in most of Cicero's letters to Terentia, *Fam.* xiv. 11, 16, 17, 21–24) or as *s.v.b.e.e.v.* (*Fam.* v. 9; x. 34; xiv. 8<sup>2</sup>) or in the longer formulas *s.v.b.e.e.q.v.* (*Fam.* v. 10, x. 33; xii. 11, 12) and *s.v.v.b.e.e.q.v.* (in two formal letters written by Cicero from his province to the Senate, *Fam.* xv. 1, 2).

It is not surprising that a more formal occasion evoked a more extensive type of salutation. Thus, for example, both Lepidus and Lentulus, when writing *Senatui populo plebique Romanae*, employ this elaborate formula: *s.v.[iberique] v[estri] v.b.e.e.q.v.*—almost identically in either case (*Fam.* x. 35, xii. 15). Cassius, too, writing formal letters (*Fam.* xii. 11, 12) as proconsul, uses the Plinian formula; whereas *s.v.b.* introduces an intimate letter, replete with Greek, written by him to Cicero (*Fam.* xv. 19).

Cicero begins a letter to the family (xiv. 14) with "*si vos valetis, nos valeamus*"; the wording seems cold, but the inscription is more intimate than in any other letter<sup>3</sup>—and the date is early January, 49. An affectionate reference to his children appears in the greeting of a letter to Terentia (*Fam.* xiv. 5): "*si tu et Tullia, lux nostra, valetis, ego et suavissimus Cicero valeamus.*" Luceius once (*Fam.* v. 14) comments on his own formula, thus: "*s.v.b.e.v., sicut soleo, paululo tamen etiam deterius quam soleo.*" The flighty Dolabella<sup>4</sup> goes one better (*Fam.* ix. 9): "*s.v.g[audeo] v. et Tullia nostra recte v. Terentia minus belle habuit,*" etc.

It remains to mention that formula of greeting which strikes the modern reader as peculiar, almost humorous. When the proconsul of Cisalpine Gaul, Q. Metellus Celer, in January, 62, took Cicero severely to task for his words about the governor's brother, Metellus Nepos, he began briefly, "*si vales benest*" (*Fam.* v. 1). Cicero, in a stilted letter of self-exculpation, begins: "*si tu exercitusque valetis, benest*" (*Fam.* v. 2). Clearly, Cicero had been nettled; and, if the formula occurred only here, one might indulge in speculation. But it appears again, in another formal letter (*Fam.* v. 7) written in 62 by Cicero to Pompeius Magnus Imperator. In either case the superscription is exceedingly formal, and one must attribute the style of greeting to the demands of Roman etiquette. Even Cicero did not write often to a governor in his province.

W. A. LAIDLAW

UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS

<sup>1</sup> A very elaborate letter from C. Cassius.

<sup>2</sup> A letter to Terentia.

<sup>3</sup> "Tullius Terentiae et pater Tulliae, duabus animis suis, et Cicero matri optimae, suavissimae sorori S.P.D."

<sup>4</sup> In a letter written from Caesar's camp, perhaps at Caesar's instigation.



## THE JOHN GRISWOLD WHITE COLLECTION

Comments at recent philological meetings have revealed an all too hazy knowledge on the part of scholars concerning the collection of printed catalogues of manuscripts in the city of Cleveland. It is the purpose of this note to set forth in a general way the value and accessibility of the collection, "to the end that," as its founder desired, "those who seek further information may know where to go to find it."

Mr. John Griswold White, late president of the board of trustees of the Cleveland Public Library, gave to the library more than seventy-five thousand books and pamphlets covering the fields of orientalia, folklore, early travels, early literature of Europe, early chronicles and histories of the Dark and Middle Ages, linguistic material in the shape of grammars and dictionaries, historical geography, archeology and numismatics, and, most important perhaps for readers of this *Journal*, catalogues of manuscripts. By far the greater part of these volumes are housed in the spacious room on the third floor of the library which is wholly devoted to the John Griswold White Collection. The collection is ably administered by Mr. Gordon W. Thayer, whose acquisitions from the interest on the endowment since the death of Mr. White have materially increased the extent of the collection and who is constantly endeavoring both to fill any gaps which still remain and to add current publications as they appear.

The printed catalogues of manuscripts list manuscripts in some fifty languages; of those concerned with Latin and Greek there are at present more than six hundred volumes which offer a rich selection to the classical scholar. Most of those ordinarily found in a paleographical collection are included; it may be well, however, in the absence of a union catalogue, to list here a few of the rare items which are consulted with greater difficulty in this country at least. The White Collection is proud to possess, for example, Daniel de Nessel, *Catalogus sive recensio specialis omnium codicum manuscriptorum Graecorum nec non linguarum orientalium bibliothecae Caesareae Vindobonensis* (Vienna, 1690); Bernard, *Catalogi librorum manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae in unum collecti* (Oxford, 1697); *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum bibliothecae regiae* (4 vols.; Paris, 1739-44); Bandini, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum varia continens opera Graecorum patrum* (3 vols.; Florence, 1764-70) and *Catalogus codicum Latinorum (et Italicorum) bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae* (5 vols.; Florence, 1774-78); and Academia Caesarea Vindobonensis, *Tabulae codicum manuscriptorum praeter Graecos et orientales in bibliotheca palatina Vindobonensi asservatorum* (10 vols.; Vienna, 1864-99). Among the smaller treasures are the following: Montfaucon, *Bibliotheca Coisliniana, olim Segueriana* (Paris, 1715); Lami, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum qui in bibliotheca Riccardiana adservantur* (Livorno, 1756); *Index codicum bibliothecae Alcobatiae* (Lisbon, 1775); Morelli, *Codices manuscripti Latini bibliothecae Nanianae* (Venice, 1776); Mucciolo, *Catalogus codicum manu-*

*scriptorum Malatestianae Caesenatis bibliothecae* (2 vols.; Cesena, 1780-84); Phillipps, *Catalogus manuscriptorum in bibliotheca publica apud Lille in Gallia* (1828); *Index to the Additional Manuscripts, with Those of the Egerton Collection, Preserved in the British Museum and Acquired in the Years 1783-1835* (London, 1849) (this fills the gap between Ayscough's catalogue of 1782 and the quinquennial lists begun in 1836; the White copy is that which belonged to the bibliographer of Christopher Columbus, Henry Harrisse, and has on the flyleaf a note in his hand to the effect that only a hundred copies were printed); Ledieu, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque de Péronne* (Paris, 1897), of which twenty-five copies were printed; Lavalley, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque municipale de Caen* (Caen, 1880), of which one hundred and fifty copies were printed.

The John Griswold White Collection is open on weekdays from 9:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. Scholars who may wish information from any of its catalogues, but who cannot consult them in person, will find Mr. Thayer always happy to co-operate in the furthering of philological research. The White Collection is also glad in most cases to send out its catalogues on interlibrary loans.

DOROTHY M. SCHULLIAN

LAKEWOOD, OHIO

#### MATERIALS FOR THE HISTORY OF THE EGYPTIAN GODS

For some years I have been engaged in making a collection of monuments relating to the cult of the Egyptian gods in Hellenistic and Roman times. I believe that such a collection would be useful in somewhat the same way that Cumont's collection of Mithraic material has been.

I do not intend to include written documents since the materials for this cult are so voluminous. Hopfner's *Fontes* contains the literary materials, and a collection of the inscriptions and papyri should be made by someone skilled in epigraphy and papyrology.

I wish to include statuary and figured monuments: statues, reliefs, altars, columns, etc. I shall not be able to include all the small bronzes, terracottas, and metal figurines, nor the coins. I have recently published privately a preliminary repertory of materials which I should be glad to send to anyone who is interested. I would appreciate notices of monuments and especially photographs, since my aim is to publish photographs of all the important pieces. Payment will be made for any expenses incurred.

THOMAS A. BRADY

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

## BOOK REVIEWS

*A History of Roman Religion.* By FRANZ ALTHEIM; translated by HAROLD MATTINGLY. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1938. Pp. xi+548. \$5.00.

In his interpretation of the *Carmen arvale*, presented during the celebration of the tercentenary of the founding of Harvard University, Eduard Norden made use of "the two sources of knowledge whereby we may hope to understand a cult-song of such high antiquity . . . the *history of language* and the *history of religion*" (see Harvard Tercentenary Publications, Harvard Tercentenary Conference of Arts and Sciences, *Independence, Convergence, and Borrowing in Institutions, Thought, and Art* [Cambridge, Mass., 1937], p. 60). Others also have high hopes of a "streamlined" remarriage of Mercury (ὡς συνεκδοχικῶς εἰπεῖν) and Philologia: G. van Langenhove, *Linguistische Studien*, I (1936), 22-34 ("La Linguistique et l'histoire des religions"),<sup>1</sup> or K. Marot, "Langue et religion: une esquisse,"<sup>2</sup> will serve as recent specimens of the new trend; and, on a somewhat different footing, in its appeal to linguistic evidence specifically for the reconstruction of prehistoric and non-Roman Italy, Altheim's *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (Berlin, 1931-33), now considerably enlarged and translated into English, puts the new method into practice on the grand scale, at least in the first half of the book, which is the more important. So far as I know, the German original has not been reviewed in any American journal. The reunion, unless new doubts bring a new divorce, promises well and already has produced some striking offspring.

The method of linguistic analysis, however, is a two-edged weapon; its potency is exceedingly tempting and imagination is likely to run riot with the results—χαίρων ὥσπερ σκυλάκιον τῷ ἔλκειν τε καὶ σπαράττειν τῷ λόγῳ. Both familiarity with the linguistic as well as with the other kinds of evidence upon which Altheim founds his argument, and independent criticism, are as necessary as the power to distinguish sound from fallacious reasoning if a man is to write or to read a book like this with profit or even to translate it. Altheim's book is not easy to appraise as a whole, and it is to me a cause for rejoicing that another review of it will appear over the signature of my colleague, A. D. Nock, *amicus certus in re incerta*. The marvel is that any one man alone should have written it: *non omnia possumus omnes*. But a good cobbler, Stoic or not, has more than one last, and I have only praise for Altheim's recognition of the importance of placing the history of religion in ancient

<sup>1</sup> Rijksuniversiteit te Gent, Werken uitgegeven door de Faculteit van de Wijsbegeerte en Letteren, 77e Afllevering, Antwerp-Paris-'S Gravenhage.

<sup>2</sup> *L'Antiquité classique*, V (1936), 249-61.

Rome and Italy within a framework that comprehends at least the prehistory and the history of ancient Italy as a totality and, at times, also reaches beyond, to the entire Mediterranean world (Introduction to Book I). The principle is sound, differ as we may in matters of detail. I find myself in agreement, too, with Altheim's view of the proper approach to the study of the whole development of Italo-Roman culture—in particular the contrast that he draws between the forces of Italic national consciousness and the catholicity of Greek culture, the impact of which, "surpassing nation and history," released the "native forces of Italy" (Introduction to Book II; cf. the last chapter of my *Foundations of Roman Italy*). And he may well be right (p. 223) in his remarks about historical periods within "a world of system," "a timeless sphere" with successive stages of rhythmical development represented "as an order," at least if analogies drawn from the history and development of language have any validity; it is almost as easy, and as unedifying, to depreciate, as it is to exaggerate, the division of history into epochs, or the significance of the division when it is made.

After having read the entire volume slowly and carefully, and many parts of it more than once, I am tempted to suggest to the student of Roman religion per se that he would wisely begin by reading pages 226–31. Here Altheim gives what is substantially a summary of the early stages of Roman religion, as he sees them, free from the mass of detailed evidence and theories that are discussed in Book I ("Ancient Italy") and Book II ("Ancient Rome"); the bearing of much in these on Altheim's subject is usually real enough but often remote and sometimes hypothetical, and they are quite out of proportion in the length to which they run. The contents of Book I are not to be found in the German original at all; in Book II the last chapter is an addition, and the first chapter is still concerned with archeology and Italy at large as much as, or more than, with the religion of the people of Rome. Besides, Altheim is not always proof against the attractions of "the latest theory" where pre-Roman Italy is concerned. At the other end of the volume the chapter on the *Carmen saeculare* is new (Book IV, "The Augustan Age," chap. v), and two of the chapters in Book V, "The Empire" (the others in that book were part of Vol. III, *Die Kaiserzeit*, in the German original), are added. The strict relevance of one of these (V. i, "The Causes of the Greatness of Rome") to Altheim's proper subject is debatable. The thinly veiled defense of paganism and the determination to minimize the strength of orientalism in Roman cult under the Empire strike me as equivocal. It is too late in the day convincingly to be reminded (p. 540, n. 22) of "the words of Goethe about the advantages that 'are only to be reconciled with a pagan outlook,'" or to be advised (p. 471, cf. p. 422) that the virtue in any revival of antiquity is conferred by the recovery not (naïvely enough) of a "simple belief in the old gods" but of "the attitude to man and the world, of which those gods were the expression"; fortunately, Altheim stops short (p. 425) of requiring the modern historian of Roman religion "to realize completely for himself a belief in the

Roman gods"! The whitewashing of Augustus (pp. 367 f., 384 ff.), talk of the willingness of ancient peoples "to make the sacrifice of their own character and independence" to Rome (p. 325), words such as these (p. 412)—

Finally, in the years since the War what was before only visible in its first beginnings has reached fulfilment. What I mean is the formation of those great groups of political ideas which are no longer confined to single peoples, but which encompass whole groups of nations. However heavily and inexorably the narrowing of the economic field of play, the fight for raw materials and markets may press on us, those systems of ideas are so powerful that they must be brought into action in the struggle for economic self-preservation. Only by their aid can one maintain oneself in this struggle.

No people and no state can dispense with these systems. The cheap assertion that they are mere catch-words, good enough to serve the immediate purpose of mobilizing popular opinion, misses the decisive point—

and those that follow (p. 413) in the course of the discussion of the Roman *imperium*, the implied preference for the reading *paci* at *Aen.* vi. 852 and the translation of *pacique imponere morem* as "to lend to peace morality and law" (p. 416), the conviction that Augustus encountered and maintained something other than a mere revival, or attempted revival, as the evidence has led historians persistently but mistakenly to see it "of a world once and for ever lost" (p. 394), and that he was more than successful in turning back the current of demoralizing influences that threatened Roman religion in his day, in short the theme that runs through the whole of chapters iv and v of Book IV and chapter i of Book V—all this reads like special pleading:

The consciousness [of the Romans] of being an instrument involves the consciousness of being the bearer of a historical mission. This it is that raises the Romans to a singular elect station. By submitting to the gods they became masters of the world.

Is this result at which we have arrived, in contrast to views previously held, really incredible? Hardly so, we think [p. 428].

There follows a comparison of the growth of the British Empire with that of the Roman that fails to mention the large dose of *laissez faire* that goes into the prescription for both of them.

The discerning reader will have noticed for himself that there is left, for treatment in Book III, Roman religion during the republic. This central book, not the longest of the five, shows less novelty of theory and exposition. It is, I think, the best of them all.

I turn to some points of detail. First the translation. This, on the whole, has been reasonably well done and, in general, is readable. Here and there it is too obviously a translation (e.g., pp. 20, 300, 309, 331, 433, 488) and sometimes it comes near to jargon (e.g., pp. 15, 16, 161), or keeps too close to the German original (e.g., pp. 14, 64, 228). The expressions "silent spirant" (p. 14), "sonant 'tenues'" (p. 13), and "soft spirant" (p. 14) make my hair stand

on end; for all three "voiceless spirant" (or "fricative") or "breathed spirant" is what is meant. "Smooth" in the sense of "voiceless plosive" (pp. 103, 113, 115, 118) is just as horrifying. "Variation of the diphthong *eu* > *ou*" (p. 13) means nothing more than "the change from *eu* to *ou*." On page 157 we are told that the "Greek word" *λίτρα* "was taken over by an Italian tribe," but on page 14 we were told that *λίτρα* was a Sicel word "taken over into Greek" with *τ* for *β* of Italic or Sicel \**liβra* (Latin *libra*, from a still older \**lidhra*). What has happened is that the innocent *von* of the original ("von einem itali-schen Stamme her übernommen" [*Röm. Religionsgeschichte*, I, 92]) has been mistranslated "by" instead of "from" (the *her* ought to have prevented that, even if common sense did not). An attentive reader is vexed by the apparent contradiction and, unless he knows his dialects, will find it difficult to say offhand what the truth of the matter is. By the irony that dogs the steps of all translators the sentence (p. 65), "Their historical existence is filled by a gradual break through to such pre- and proto-historic formations, implying a re-awakening and renewal of what elsewhere was long past and gone," is preceded by the encomium, "Or, to express it more sharply"! The expression "sacral conceptions" (p. 110) is at least an oddity. The printing of "mars.," "pelignian," and "oscan" (p. 113) looks like hack work, and so does "calender" (sic, p. 163) and "Martian. Capella" (p. 170, cf. p. 163), "nathless" (p. 436), and the omission of the indefinite article on pages 222 and 231 and the addition of the definite on page 468 (l. 3 from the bottom); "find-spot" (p. 462) in the sense of "provenance" is not English, or at least not my English, neither is "prospectless" (p. 167).

In the notes, all gathered together at the end, so that the reader must grow old forever turning pages back and forth, usually not to pursue the argument but merely to stare at a bald reference, E. Vetter becomes Th. Vetter (pp. 475, 519), Schuchardt is both C. and K. (p. 477), J. L. Myres becomes F. L. Myres (p. 479), R. Thurneysen is F. Thurneysen (p. 485), W. M. Ramsay is A. Ramsay (p. 486), Parvan is Purvan (p. 491), a single Weinstock is both St. and H. (p. 498), R. Meringer becomes J. Meringer (twice) and A. Walde becomes E. Walde (all on p. 504), J. B. Hofmann is F. B. Hofmann (pp. 507, 516), A. della Seta is G. della Seta (p. 514), T. Frank is J. Frank (p. 516). Why? Twice (pp. 237 and 239) we have Jarquinii for Tarquinii.<sup>3</sup> The spelling "sarchophagus," since it occurs on pages 55, 57, 70, and 539, must be something more than a misprint. We have both "Virgil" (*passim*) and "Vergil" (p. 158). Some references are too cryptic for me, as, for example, Pasquali, *Preistoria della poesia romana* (an 83-page pamphlet) "155 n. 1" (p. 475), or "Festschr. A. Vendryès zum 3. 7. 1906" (p. 510), though no doubt I could get at them by taking the time and trouble the author should have taken. "Op, cit.," that snare and delusion, if more than a page old, does not, on page 512. I am sure, refer to the last previously mentioned work of von Blumenthal, two

<sup>3</sup> On p. 287 it is Tarquiniae, which looks like a blend of Tarquinii and Tarquinia.



of whose brochures are named on page 510, and in places the German *a.O.* (p. 476) is left untranslated; *IPEK* (pp. 480, 513) adds a new terror to life (it is *Jahrbuch f. praehist. und ethnogr. Kunst*, see p. 477). The reference to Schwyzzer (p. 498) given as *Rh. Mus.* 35 must be for *Rh. Mus.*, Vol. LXXXIV (1935).<sup>4</sup> I know this because it is a recent paper, and I have read it. But, ten years from now, a student consulting Altheim will be baffled and infuriated by this sort of carelessness. On page 350, *for hoard read horde*; and on page 471 the spelling *literarum* actually has been substituted for *litterarum* of the German text—so true is it that Englishmen rarely know how to spell Latin. And Paelignian *iouies pocles* (p. 515) instead of *puclois iouiuis* (*ID*, No. 210), or [*iouies puc[es]*] (*ID*, No. 260b), shows a disrespect for accuracy that must be visited on both author and translator: for the Paelignian is *puclois iouiuis*, and *iouies puc[es]* is Marsian, but it is *puc[es]* and it could not have been *pocles*. The German original had *pucles*, but ascribed it to Paelignian, which it is not.

P. 7, l. 3. *For makes read make*.

P. 10. "Umbro-Sabellian" instead of "Osco-Umbrian" is at the very least misleading. And Picentine (i.e., "East Italic" or "Old Sabellian") is, *pace* von Blumenthal, not an Italic dialect but rather Illyrian. Meringer long ago tried, with no success, to treat even the Novilara texts as Umbrian (*Zeitschr. Öst. Gymn.*, 1894, p. 680; cf. *PID*, II, 210 f.).

Pp. 11 and 12. Altheim is doubtless right in his rejection of the old "Stammbaumtheorie" of the differentiation of the Indo-European languages and dialects. Indeed, I know of no competent authority who accepts it today. But he goes too far when he writes (p. 12) that in the groups of Italic languages "there is no question of an original unity." It is not to be denied that there is an essential unity behind them. There is no means of explaining the different elements of agreement or degrees of difference among the Indo-European languages except on the assumption that they spring from an original common speech, which was highly homogeneous in its character, though divided into dialects already at the earliest date at which we can assume anything certain about it. Altheim is much nearer the truth in the statement that immediately follows and corrects his first and too sweeping assertion: "Severally they [i.e., the groups of Italic dialects] loosed themselves from the Indo-Germanic complex and arrived in Italy at different periods."

P. 12. "The Latins share their term for fire (*ignis*) with Lithuanian," etc., while Osco-Umbrian "shares its terms (*\*pur*) with Greek," etc. What about Umb. *krematra* and Latin *cremare*?

P. 13. Some features which connect Venetic very closely with Latin have been emphasized recently by M. S. Beeler, *HSCP*, XLIX (1938), 265-68. Altheim's (or is it Mattingly's?) "Venetian" for "Venetic" is misleading.

P. 14. It is not true that there is but "one surviving inscription" in Sicel.

<sup>4</sup> Von Blumenthal's would-be corrections of Schwyzzer, in the following volume of *Rh. Mus.*, have nothing to commend them.



Altheim himself speaks (pp. 14–15) of the “newly discovered inscription of Licodia Eubea,” which he counts Sicel, though in the place of publication to which he refers it is claimed as “Sican,” and it is not in fact free from suspicion (*CP*, XXIX [1934], 281, n. 1). There are, however, apart from it, *four* certain Sicel inscriptions.

The correct explanation of *libra*: *λίτρα* was given independently also by Conway (*ID*, p. 46) in 1897. But if *Ἀιδνή* is genuine Sicel, as I am inclined to think myself (*PID*, II, 464 f.), with *δ* for I.Eu. *dh* (*αἶθω*, *aedes*), then *λίτρα* (not *\*λιδρα*) is not pure Sicel, unless, as there is some reason for believing (*PID*, II, 474 f.), Sicel itself shows a variation between media and tenuis. On the whole it would appear that *λίτρα* is a Graecized form, and this distinction should have been brought out more clearly; for, if that explanation is right, *Αἷτρνη* also must be Graecized (for the Sicel *Ἀιδνή*), even though *αἰτρίξειν* (not, *pace* Altheim, *Αἷτρνη*) “is attested as Sicel.” Altheim writes as if both *Αἷτρνη* (for *\*αιβνᾱ*) and *Ἀιδνή* (for *\*aidnā*) were Sicel. It looks, rather, as if *Αἷτρνη* was borrowed into Greek from Sicel *\*αιβνᾱ* which remained in Sicel, then becoming *\*aidnā*, and it is not at all probable that there was a “change from” *Αἷτρνη* to *Ἀιδνή*.

P. 15. Niedermann’s equation “Sicel ζάγκλη = Latin *fulcula*” is very dubious (see Walde’s criticisms in *Woch. f. kl. Phil.*, 1920, p. 374; and *PID*, II, 451).

P. 15 (cf. p. 33). I still hold, against all comers, Altheim included, that Ligurian may be counted I.Eu. “with certainty,” and I am pleased to see that Pokorný also rejects Krahe’s flat *ipse dixit*. Pokorný writes (*Z. f. celt. Phil.*, XXI [1938], 74), with justice, “Die Existenz einer idg. Oberschicht darf für Ligurien nicht mehr bestritten werden; die Zahl einwandfreier idg. Ortsnamen ist allerdings weitaus grösser, als man nach den neuesten Ausführungen Krahes (*Hirt Festschrift*, II, 241) annehmen müsste,” etc. I quote this for the benefit of the compiler, editor, and readers of *Year’s Work*, 1937, p. 93. (To *ekupeθaris* I shall return elsewhere.)

P. 17. It is quite misleading to label the Etruscan stratum in Italy, even when it is “supra-tribal,” “ancient Italian.”

P. 22. If I mistake not, *Gozo* is the usual spelling.

P. 27. Not even the new Liddell and Scott knows *πολόγυιον*.

P. 29 (cf. p. 32). It is by no means clear that the Novilara texts are not Indo-European (*Foundations*, pp. 107 f., 203, 245). The contrary view is by far the more likely to be proved right in the end. Nor is it certain that their alphabet is Corinthian in origin, though (cf. Beaumont, *JHS*, LVI [1936], 159–204) there is ample evidence of Greek influence in the Adriatic before the fourth century B.C. Norden’s identification of one of the animals sketched on the Fano stele as a lion, which Altheim accepts, appears to me highly improbable.

P. 31. What is the source of the form *Sebenicus* as the ancient name of the Lago d’Isco? Pliny gives *Sebinnus* (*NH*, iii, 131, ii, 224). And *Numicius* is a better attested nominative than *Numicus* (p. 35).

P. 35. Compare the disappearance of Epidius in the Sarnus (Suet. *De rhet.* iv. 3).<sup>5</sup>

P. 37, l. 9. *For* in *read* is.

P. 37. The division of a cella by a central line of columns occurs often enough (at Troy, sixth stratum; at Sparta, Thermon in Aetolia, Neandrea in the Troad, Locri in S. Italy, as well as at Paestum), and traces of such an arrangement remain elsewhere (e.g., the temple of Hera at Samos), so that we should be wary of assuming that the intention was necessarily to make provision for a divine pair.

P. 39 (cf. pp. 128, 154, 216, 299). Despite what von Blumenthal has written in addition to Kretschmer's contention that the name *Ulixes* came into Latin through Messapic, the case is not proved. In the first place it can be asserted positively that *-d-* did not become *-l-* in Messapic (see *PID*, II, 562). Kretschmer himself shows that the name is written with *-λ-*, not *-δ-*, on Athenian, Boeotian, and Corinthian vases, and regards the *-λ-* as due to an Epirote change. Second, as for the sound written *-σσ-* or *-ττ-* in Greek, it was probably as closely as possible represented in Latin by *x*, certainly not by *-ss-* or *-tt-*, as Schwyzler has observed (*Gr. Gram.* [1934], p. 318); that is to say the *-x-*, or something close to it, was in the Greek word itself to begin with. Third, as for the vocalism, Latin *-es* for Greek *-εϋς* is normal, *-i-* is to be found in Greek itself (Cor. 'Ολι(σ)σεύς, Arg. 'Ολισσεῖδαι) and is by no means unusual as a Latin writing of the sound *ū*. The Messapic alphabet, moreover, has no *u*-symbol, so that the initial *U-* for *O-* can hardly be ascribed to it, and has, in fact, been explained as a change in the pretonic syllable (Lindsay, *L.L.*, p., 200). Finally, Wackernagel's view that in the original Greek form *-λ-* is the normal thing and that it is the *-δ-* of Epic which requires explanation, deserves serious consideration; see the remarks of B. Friedmann, *Die ionischen und attischen Wörter im Allatein* (Helsingfors, 1937), p. 92, n. 1.

P. 41. Besides the Etruscan and Lydian forms (*aritimi*, *artimuš*) of the divine name, and the personal name 'Αρτίμης, note also the Illyrian personal names *Artemo*, *Artemia*, and Messap. *artemes* (*PID*, Vol. III, s.v.).

Well, that brings me to the end of chapter i in Book I, and from my notes I see that I could go on in the same way to the end of the volume, notes included. Enough has been adduced, however, to show that, despite the positive merits of the work, which are many and great, there is much theoretical detail in it that is dubious or even indefensible, and a good deal of haste and carelessness in either the original or the translation or both that arouse the suspicions of more careful folk. Besides, it is easy enough to pick holes in a man's work, while ignoring his real object and actual achievements. I propose now, therefore, first to call attention to some of the more flagrant lapses in the

<sup>5</sup> On the divine character of the Sarnus see P. Aebischer, *Rev. belge de philol. et d'hist.*, IX (1930), 421-54.

rest of the volume which call for correction and, after that, to sum it up as a whole.

P. 66. For *δυναστεύ δαντος* read *δυναστεύσαντος*.

P. 75 (cf. p. 96). The entire theory, due to von Duhn, of a "last wave of the Indo-Germanic Italians, the 'inhumating people,'" rests, in my judgment (and in that of Randall-MacIver), upon a grave misinterpretation of the archeological evidence and ought to be decently buried.

P. 101 (cf. p. 114). The protests of Kretschmer, to which Altheim himself refers (p. 495, n. 18), against the explanation of the name *Volcanus* as Etruscan, are not lightly to be dismissed. Certainly the Raetic *velxanu* is not in its favor, for Raetic is not Etruscan. The very inscription which shows that form also has *φελνα νινυταλίνα* (i.e., quasi "Beleno \*Vinifero"). In like manner (p. 102), evidence for the Illyrian (not Etruscan) origin of *Palatium* is considerable, though I agree that the substitution of *P-* for *B-* is probably due to an Etruscan pronunciation. Altheim has simply put the cart before the horse by writing (p. 113, cf. p. 115) that a change from *tenuis* (Mattingly writes "smooth"! ) to *media* is "characteristic of the rewriting of Etruscan words in Italian dialects." Even if *Volgani* is to be put down as Etruscan, I suppose I am right in refusing to admit that *gondecorant* and *gonlegium* are Etruscan. Then the consonant gemination in *Adius*: *Addius*, *Decius*: *Deccius*, *Pacius*: *Paccius* (p. 118) points to a pronunciation with *ī* or *īī*, and is, therefore, of a totally different order from the gemination in *Spurina*: *Spurinna*, *Porsena*: *Porsenna*. But to talk of a "variation between smooth and 'media'" (p. 118) in reference to the relation between forms with initial *p-* (*Ποῦρέννιος*) and forms with initial *f-* (*Furinius*) is sheer nonsense: *p* is a voiceless plosive and *f* a voiceless spirant (not an aspirate). In many—not all—cases it is perfectly true that Etruscan and Latin names "can be plainly distinguished" (p. 149): then why confuse them? The details of the relationships, however, are often far more complex and ambiguous than Altheim appears to realize.

P. 126. What good ground is there, if any, for asserting that *divus pater Falacer* "appears within Messapian religion"? Messapic *balakrahiaihī* (PID, 502) is a *personal* name, found on a tombstone. And if, as we may, we derive it from a simple \**balakras*, still, that is far better compared with Macedonian *Bάλακρος* (a *personal* name) and Thessalian *Φάλακρος*, *Φαλάκρειος* (IG, IX, Part II, No. 517). In fact, Thessalian has *Σιμίας Φαλάκρειος* exactly like Messap. *dazimaihi balakrahiaihī*. There is only Altheim's imagination to make the latter into a divine name.

Pp. 139 and 140. Altheim's contention that Osc. *Mamers* is borrowed from Latin is both improbable and unnecessary. There is a much simpler explanation ready to hand. We may be sure that Oscan (as well as Latin) allowed reduplication in view of the certain Oscan forms *μαμερκίης*, *μαμερτινο*, *mamertio-*, and (Campanian, i.e., Etr.-Osc.) *mamurkes*. Now, by the regular Oscan syncope we shall have from \**ma(r)marts* first \**māmrtis* and then (by samprasā-

raña)<sup>6</sup> \**māmerts*, whence *Māmerts*, explicitly attested by ancient authority as Oscan and Sabine. It is inconceivable that the Marsi, the Marrucini, and the Mamertini all knew themselves only by a name derived from that of a Roman (or Latin) god. Can we imagine German tribes calling themselves by the name of (say) a Japanese divinity? All this is clinched by the discovery, made about a decade ago, of an Oscan inscription at Aeclanum in which the form *mamrt[ei]*, dat. sing., actually occurs (*N.d. Sc.*, 1930, p. 401, Fig. 1, cf. *Riv. I.G.I.*, XV [1931], 198).

P. 143. By what right does Altheim call *Δειπάτυρος* Messapic? The word is not even mentioned by Krahe in the place to which Altheim's reference is made. Kretschmer in *Glotta*, XIII, 113 claimed it as Illyrian. And that claim rests upon Hesychius, who gives us *Δειπάτυρος* as the name of a god among the Stymphaei or Tymphaei—in Aetolia, or near Pindus. If *Δειπάτυρος* had been Messapic, I should have put it into *PID*. But it is not, and I did not.

P. 151. I cannot see why there should be anything very "particular" about the fact that "Etruscan artisans worked in Etruria."

P. 161. On Pasquali's theory of the saturnian meter see my review of his *Preistoria della poesia romana* in *AJP*, LVIII (1937), 483-88. My view differs *toto caelo* from Altheim's that Pasquali has succeeded in showing that "the Saturnian metre, in the last resort, goes back to a combination of two Greek cola."

P. 163. Altheim urges that the name of the month, *mensis Iunius*, "perhaps comes from South Etruria and passed from there to Rome." This is specious reasoning with a vengeance. Every schoolboy knows that *Iuno* is Latin; Altheim has just told us that in Etruscan the name of the goddess is *uni*. He knows that we have good independent evidence in the glossaries that *aclus* was the Etruscan name of June. He continues, in fact: "That *Aclus* is in other places recorded as the Etruscan name of June is no serious objection." It is as if one argued that English *Wednesday* is borrowed from modern High German (OHG, *Wuotan*) and then went on to add: "That *Mittwoch* is in other places recorded as the German name of Wednesday is no serious objection"! There is, I know, a difficulty in relating *Iunius* to *Iuno*. But Altheim's is not the way to solve it.

P. 179. Why is the festival of the *Poptifugia* assigned to "the third of July" instead of to the fifth?

P. 183. *For* <sup>15</sup> read <sup>42</sup>; and then on pp. 182-83, delete reference number 39 and renumber 40-42 to read 39-41.

Pp. 184 and 185. The true explanation, at which Warde Fowler hinted many years ago, of the pairs of names in Gellius, e.g., *Lua Saturni*, is really very simple. If for *Saturni* we substitute *Saturnia* (so that *Lua Saturnia* is parallel to *Iuno Saturnia*, which is at least as old as Ennius, and also to the

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Buck, *Gram. of Oscan and Umbrian*, p. 60.

Umbrian *Prestate Cerfie*, *Tefre Iuwie* and many others, in which the adjectives in *-io-* are themselves derivatives of names of divinities that have come to be used as epithets of other divinities), then the difficulty vanishes. And we are entitled so to do. *Saturnius* is a good Latin equivalent of the genitive *Saturni*. In fact, in the *o*-stems, the genitive singular masculine goes back to an Indo-European feminine collective "singular" (cf. Skt. *devī*, fem. of *devās*). Of course, all that was lost to popular consciousness long before our records begin (cf. Warde Fowler, *Religious Experience of the Roman People*, pp. 150-54), and hence new pairs of names, with genitives from stems other than the *o*-stems, were formed analogically. It is not, as Latte took it, a matter of interpreting *Ops Consiu(i)a* like *Maia Volcani*, but rather of interpreting *Maia Volcani* like *Ops Consiu(i)a*, i.e., as *Maia Volcania*. Cf. *Venus Iouia* in *CIL*, I<sup>2</sup>, 675 (*Eph. Epigr.*, VIII, 460).

P. 203 (cf. n. 9 on p. 509). If *\*Ιρβος* is genuinely Laconian, it cannot be the source of *Virbius*, for the digamma was preserved in Laconian. So far as I can find, *\*Ιρβος* is unknown before Pausanias (iii. 16. 9), and if it has any connection with *Virbius* at all, it cannot be genuinely Laconian. Ribezzo's suggestion, cited by Altheim, is frankly impossible. For the older initial digamma *β-* appears in Laconian in the second century after Christ, and *β-* survives to this day in Tzakonian.

P. 207. It is utterly impossible, by any means, to equate *θηπιον* and *Faunus*. It is *θαῖνον* alone, not *θηπιον* also, that may well be cognate with *Faunus*, *Danus*. Once more the translator is at fault; the German has *sie* "it," not *sie*, "them."

Pp. 209-10. These remarks about Illyrian are wild shots. In the first place we have good evidence for the change of I.Eu. *dh* to *d* in Messapic *hipades*, but the change of *gh* is to *h*, at least in Messapic, rather than to *g* (see *PID*, II, 604, and III, 23, s.v. "*hipades*"). Second, since Illyrian was a *centum*-dialect, and Albanian is not, it is improbable that Albanian is descended from Illyrian—as well as for other reasons—and rash in the extreme to appeal to Albanian in order to throw light on ancient Illyrian.

P. 258. The argument, from the borrowing of the Greek word *asylum*, that the institution was both Greek and ancient, is belied by the spelling of the word in Latin.

If Altheim's work is rather a series of essays than a consecutive history of Roman religion, it is not to be disparaged on that account. For the essays are each a unit, and they are not disconnected; they are at least united by the breadth of treatment and range of interest which characterize them; and markedly by the courageous attempt that runs through them all to consider Italy as a whole and to interpret the evidence for its ancient religious history in successive ages by what is known of the history of contemporary literature and contemporary cultures. Thus, movements which he has discovered in religion Altheim finds reflected in such unlikely quarters as prose style or

architectural style. This breaking of new ground, this novelty of approach, make the greatest contrast between his book and its German predecessor, Wissowa's *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, or even Warde Fowler's *Religious Experience of the Roman People*, which, if less "learned," was really broader-based than Wissowa's book. Altheim is certainly learned; he has read everything that ever was written about his subject, even about what he conceives to be his "proper study," and he has made use of everything that ever he read. If that is true of the German edition (1931-33), it is no less true of the English translation, which, with all its slapdash errors, is substantially a new edition, almost a new book. The portions that are new show the same desire as the rest, on the author's part, "to get everything in." However, after all, the famous curate's egg was alleged to be "good in parts." Despite the marks which the work bears of the time and place in which it was written, it is too important to be ignored. And if one regrets the complete lack of illustrations of the material objects so abundantly cited in support of the argument, at least one may rejoice in unified indexes now that the entire work is bound under one cover.

Difficult as it is to see the wood when attention is so persistently called to each and every several tree, there is no denying the importance of the wood itself. But Altheim has given us a model of determined and tireless effort in his vigorous attempt to disinter successive strata or layers in the composite rubbish heap of Roman religion that ancient writers have left us, whose accounts resemble nothing so much as the catalogue of a sale of antiques, a regular jumble sale. The modern sciences of archeology and comparative philology, moreover, have given us not only new information but also valuable criteria by which to test and classify both the old and the new knowledge. Hence Altheim still has hopes, which others have abandoned, not only of separating Greek and Italic and Roman but also of distinguishing first a Mediterranean stratum of beliefs, which Italy would share with pre-Homeric Greece and Asia Minor—the earth-goddesses, mother-goddesses, bull-deities and other animal gods, and the like—and then two Greek strata, the earlier an archaic, almost a prehistoric one, and separated only by an inconsiderable hiatus from the later which he finds to be already verging upon the Hellenistic rather than to be Hellenic in character. More promising is his restoration of the Italic picture as a unity, which places Rome in a truer perspective as compared with the Italic tribes. I am puzzled by his complete silence about the Venetic *Re-i-tia*, though it is a relief to hear no more talk about Juno as a "female *genius*."

It is regrettable that so little attention is paid to those Italic and Roman beliefs which were concerned with the many aspects of natural order and of human life and so much to the identification of the greater powers with Hellenic gods—either because they were sufficiently alike that the ancients themselves made the identifications in later days, or else, as Altheim holds in many, I am inclined to think in too many, cases, because they were identical



from the beginning, not indeed, by common derivation from a single source but because they had been imported into Italy and Rome from Greece and greater Greece.

In Book II the discussion of the *di indigites* and of the *nouensides* is left by the author, perhaps wisely, in an inconclusive position. He is evidently no longer himself so sure that *indiges* means "father of the race" (pp. 229, 143, but cf. p. 113). During and after the close of the Etruscan period Altheim sees, quite rightly, that Greek influence came indirectly to Rome—through the Etruscans, the Italic tribes, and across the Adriatic. But there is a certain danger that in addition to Etruscomania there looms upon us Illyriomania. "The figure of Aeneas reached Rome and Italy through the mediation of the Illyrians" is a recent view unhesitatingly accepted by Altheim.

The much discussed *religio*<sup>7</sup> is well turned as "attention" (pp. 270, 323) that is to "the powers manifesting themselves in the universe" and to all their aspects and affairs; "ecstasy" (p. 527) for *superstitio* is a shade overdone—"emotional personal religion" (CAH, X, 468) is a more complete way of putting it and less open to misunderstanding.

In his Introduction (p. 6) Altheim cautiously remarks that "any attempt to write a history of Roman religion will for long remain provisional." And with that we may leave his book. It is at all events a brave, if hasty, piece of work in an extraordinarily difficult field, and at times its achievement may honestly be called brilliant.

J. WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

---

*A Study of the Greek Love-Names, Including a Discussion of Paederasty and a Prosopographia.* By DAVID M. ROBINSON and EDWARD J. FLUCK. ("Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology," No. 23.) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1937. Pp. 196. \$3.00.

The discussion of pederasty, though conspicuous on the title-page of this book, is not to be found in the Table of Contents but occurs chiefly in chapter ii ("The Love-Names in Greek Literature"). The copious quotations from ancient writers, generally without translation, constitute a valuable collection of source material. Little account is taken of other aspects of Greek sexual life or of scientific studies of homosexuality in other periods or regions, though there are many quotations from classicists. Properly, in view of this limitation, consideration of the cause of the phenomenon is reduced to a minimum, though even so there is some inconsistency in it; on pages 24 f. the practice is charged to the sight of nude men in gymnasiums, but on page 44 the senior author (for his literary style is unmistakable) apparently recognizes that the matter is not so simple as that. In general, the classical evidence is fully pre-

<sup>7</sup> A note on *religiosus* by J. Joüon, *Recherches de science religieuse*, XXVI (1936), 181-85, favors the connection with *religere*; on *superstitio*, *superstitiosus* see also S. W. F. Margadant, *IF*, XLVIII (1930), 284.



sented rather than analyzed for historical conclusions, yet there is one definite conclusion from which one must dissent: that there is evidence of pederasty in Homer. In fact, there is no passage in Homer which, reasonably interpreted, contains any suggestion of pederasty. Whether the practice was actually common in the Homeric period is, of course, another question.

In the fourth chapter, which for most readers will be the principal one, the *kalos* names on Attic vases are listed, and under each name any possible identifications of the man are fully discussed. Where vases with *kalos* names have come to light since the appearance of the second edition of Klein's *Liebingsinschriften*, references to the publications are given; and several unpublished pieces are included. Students of vases will find this chapter an indispensable and most welcome supplement to Klein's work and will regret only that it does not contain complete lists of the vases, brought up to date, and thus supersede Klein altogether. Chapter i, a sort of introduction to chapter iv, is a good general discussion of the *kalos* names on vases. It is rich in quotation and citation, perhaps a little weak on the historical side.

A topic which might well have received some historical treatment, though not strictly included in the subject of the book, is the phrase *ὁ παῖς καλός*. Like their predecessors, Robinson and Fluck offer no explanation of this singularly pithless observation. American archeologists will recall a somewhat similar expression which had a great vogue before the war: "Oh you kid!" In theory an admiring salutation to a damsel, it came to be used on any occasion that called for intellectual sparkle. It was written, if not on vases, on the walls of toilets and schoolrooms with just about the same pungency, relevance, and significance as *ὁ παῖς καλός*. Sometimes, with a proper name substituted for its third word, it was used in flippant applause. On the whole, the "Oh you" formula seems to be a fairly good analogy for the *kalos* formula and suggests that no mystery, unless a psychological one, underlies *ὁ παῖς καλός*.

The third chapter contains, under eighty-two heads, "Love-Names in Literature and Art Other than Vases." The requirements for admission to this list are liberal, and a varied company is assembled. An appendix contains *kalos* names on non-Attic vases and thus renders comprehensive a book that must be used by every student of Greek vases.

FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON

University of Chicago

---

*Aeneas' Arrival in Latium: Observations on Legends, History, Religion, Topography and Related Subjects in Vergil, Aeneid VII. 1-135.* By HENRIËTTE BOAS. ("Allard Pierson Stichting, Archaeologisch-historische Bijdragen," VI.) Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers-mij. 1938. Pp. 260.

This thesis presented at the University of Amsterdam, with a very detailed study of the first part of the seventh book of the *Aeneid*, shows the results of wide reading and much industry insufficiently supported by critical

sense and orderliness of exposition. In regard to every name or idea found in the lines in question the author inquires just why Virgil selected it for inclusion, and her lively imagination evokes so many explanations—often whole series of alternative hypotheses, as on pages 54–56—that the reader is left bewildered.

Some of the arguments adduced are far-fetched, others illogical; e.g., on pages 122–23 we learn that the Laurentes may have been named after the laurel “because August [as she often calls Augustus] may have possessed an estate in the ager Laurens which may even have been called Laurentum,” one indication of this being “the fact that nowadays too the region is entirely reserved for the caccia reale”; or the circular reasoning on page 209: “The sheep itself was sometimes considered as a lustratious [*sic*] animal as may be proved by its use in the suovetaurilia and at the lustratio.” On page 122, after a long study of the cult of the laurel, she assures us that this investigation may after all be superfluous, “as Vergil may have caused the Laurentes to be named after the laurel only to remind his readers of August[us].” Again, on pages 89 and 109 Latinus is thought to prefigure Augustus, but at page 149 she accepts the more usual view of Aeneas as the prototype. With Sforza’s theory that Virgil was secretly hostile to Augustus she flirts somewhat (pp. 49, 143, and 227) but does not disclose whether we should accept it or not. Perhaps in *Aen.* vii. 116 *mensas consumimus* “means no more than ‘we are consuming our cakes,’” but, if so, why was so flat and pointless a remark made by Ascanius or recorded by Virgil?

It is the misfortune of Miss Boas (and still more of the reader) that English is for her an acquired tongue, as a glance, for example, at pages 85, 127, or 249 will at once reveal. “The mending of the fire” (155), “adstruction” (160), “chthonical” (192), “katachrese” (229), “the Hades” (43 and 44), “Excurs” (often), and “Oiebways, a tribe of Red Indians” (101) are fairly intelligible; but, when we read that the Trojan women “had buried [read “burned”] the ships for fear” (17), or that “Vergil may have been ready to take seize of this datum” (162), or that “they prefer a relation with ‘feriae’ . . . and with a root which may be based also” (176), our powers of divination are somewhat taxed, as by a word like “dectee” (= “deity” [?], p. 171). Neither German (p. 15 n.) nor Latin (p. 171: *for* *erioritus* *read* *erinitus*) escapes unscathed, while Greek is a great sufferer (e.g., eleven lines of Greek on p. 222 contain sixteen errors).

Documentation is often full but at times quite lacking (e.g., pp. 37, 83, and 226), incompletely given (e.g., p. 118 [n. 171] and 140), confusedly expressed (e.g., p. 128 [n. 253], where RE, usually meaning Pauly-Wissowa, refers to Warde Fowler’s *Religious Experience*), incorrectly furnished (e.g., pp. 38 [n. 76], 136 [n. 17], and 137 [n. 21]), with misspelled names of scholars (e.g., Riesz on p. 113; Bouché-Leclercq *passim*) and inaccurate statements of fact (e.g., on p. 166 [n. 14] it is Lomax, not Barry, who makes the statement quoted; p. 190 [n. 67], where a remark of my own about necromancy is applied to incubation).

To careless proofreading may perhaps be laid the misplacing of four lines on page 223 (belonging on p. 222) and the confusing numbering of footnotes on pages 129-34.

That among the many topics treated some may be considerably expanded is but natural. I shall here take the space to note but three: page 33, on the figure of the nurse see the works cited in my note on *Aen.* iv. 632; page 115, on birth trees see W. Mannhardt, *Wald- u. Feldkulte*, I, 46, 50; II, 23; J. G. Frazer, *Golden Bough* (3d ed.), XI, 159; S. Thompson, *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature*, V, 320, and works there cited; page 219 on *bidentes* see the works cited in my note on *Aen.* iv. 57.

In general, this is a large congeries from which the prudent scholar may learn not a little, but every user should carefully verify every reference before use and cautiously weigh every conclusion before acceptance.

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE

Harvard University

---

*The Politics of Philo Judaeus: Practice and Theory.* By ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH. With a general bibliography of Philo by HOWARD L. GOODHART and ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938. Pp. xii+348.

Professor Goodenough is one of the most industrious of Philonic scholars. He deserves our gratitude for many reasons and particularly because of the continued stimulation he gives to those who share with him the conviction that the Philonic corpus is unique in value for a study of ancient society. Without it, we shall fail of a proper understanding of many phases of life in the eastern Mediterranean. And he is quite right in thinking that Philo's works have been used too much as a textbook for religious and philosophic doctrine and too little for the glimpses of life and thought which their background gives.

This is Professor Goodenough's third considerable book on Philo and his time. The earlier ones are *The Jurisprudence of the Jewish Courts in Egypt*, published in 1929, and *By Light, Light*, published in 1935. They are all marked by strongly expressed feeling and by an effort to take all the available material into account.

The value of this book is enhanced for scholars by the elaborate Bibliography which forms much the larger part of it (pp. 128-348). The Bibliography is divided into no less than thirty-six sections and would be quite unmanageable without the separate index that has been considerably provided. With the aid of this index, I note the following omissions: B. Bruno, *Philo*; Strauss, *Renan und das Urchristenthum* (Berlin, 1874); T. Simon, *Der Logos* (Leipzig, 1906); D'Alura, *Philon et le IVème Evangile* (Paris, 1910); Schürer-Biggs, "Philo," in *Enc. Brit.* (11th and 14th ed.). There are discus-

sions of Philo as extensive as many of those listed in this Bibliography in such books as Diels's *Dozographi*, and other collections. There are further keen comments on Philo in Ch. Guignebert's, *Le Monde juif vers le temps de Jésus* ("Evol. de l'humanité" [Paris, 1935]). Again, on a special matter, it might have been useful to note Vallarsi's edition of Jerome (iii. 730-34) where Philo's etymologies are compared with Jerome's. The largest gap is the omission of those books which deal with Philo's connection or lack of connection with the Pseudosolomonic *Wisdom*. The Middle Ages ascribed this book to Philo, as may be read in John of Salisbury, who incidentally has a valid claim for a place in so inclusive a bibliography. Nearly all editions of *Wisdom*, such as those of Deane, of Gregg, and of Goodrick devote no inconsiderable space to the comparison of Philo's *Logos* with that of Pseudosolomon.

There are a few minor errors in the titles of the incunabula numbered 1508 (n. 1) and 1510. And it might have been noted that 638 is merely the English translation of 602. On the whole, however, an enormous deal of patient effort has been devoted to the task of making the Bibliography precisely accurate.

Mr. Goodenough has, as we might expect, a definite theory about Philo's political doctrine. He thinks that Philo accepted the Hellenistic notion of kingship which is here derived from Pythagoras and which makes the king a sort of god. He contends that Philo combined it with his Jewish conceptions which compelled him to reject "the king's divine person" while accepting his "divine right and prerogative."

I regret that I cannot share Mr. Goodenough's beliefs either about the Hellenistic idea of kingship or its origin or about Philo's relation to it. This is due in part to a difference in point of view in the method of dealing with a problem of this sort. Professor Goodenough picks out passages and examines all that has been said about them and about Philo's doctrine generally on these matters and presents his own point of view in relation to the theories he rejects. But it would seem so much more profitable to utilize the means made available for us by the Index of Leisegang to the Cohn-Wendland *Philo*. After all, what Philo said is the best evidence of what Philo meant, and a painstaking review of all the passages that directly or indirectly refer to kings or royal government—not merely a selection of these passages—should precede theorizing. It is hard to see that Philo uses βασιλεύς and βασιλεια otherwise than as ordinary Greek words with a vague penumbra of connotations determined largely by the context.

One of Professor Goodenough's most labored doctrines is that which is presented by his second chapter, "Politics in Code." It is his view that Philo in his many references to biblical and other situations was making covert allusions to the Roman government which he repudiated and detested. This would not in itself be an impossible theory. Indeed, throughout the Talmud there are frequent references to Rome under the name of "Edom," and these references are hostile enough in all conscience. But these talmudic passages were written long after the destruction of the Temple and of the Jewish state

and were written in Aramaic—not in Greek or Latin—by irreconcilable zealots. There is not the slightest evidence that Philo was anti-Roman or that he was restive under the Roman organization of the Mediterranean world. There was a strong nationalist group in the Jewish city of Alexandria, but Philo did not belong to it.

As a special example of the dangers to which such a preconception will lead one we need merely note what Professor Goodenough says on pages 22–23:

To make clear the person to whom he is referring by his treatment of Joseph, Philo suddenly leaps ahead of his story, temporarily forgets the sheaves, and says that this is the man who is appointed *ἐπίτροπος* "or governor of all Egypt," the place second in honor to the king (*βασιλεύς*). No such title is given Joseph in Genesis, and the use especially of the word *ἐπίτροπος* must have told any person in Alexandria what Philo meant. For *ἐπίτροπος* was in Philo's day one of the official translations of the title of the Praefectus Aegypti.

Now, as a matter of fact, the phrase in Philo (*Somn.* ii. 43, Loeb Philo v. 461) is *ἐπίτροπος ἡ κηδεμών*, which is anything but a specific title. The expression *οἰσόμενος δευτεραῖα* is an obvious reference to Gen. 41: 43, *ἐπὶ τὸ ἄρμα τὸ δεύτερον* (cf. *Somn.* ii. 46). But, more particularly, we may note that the official translations of *praefectus Aegypti* are *ἐπαρχος* and *ἡγεμών*, not *ἐπίτροπος* at all. Philo's reference to Flaccus as *ἐπίτροπος* (Flac. 2) is merely a generalized allusion to the etymology of the word. The verb *ἐπιτρέπω* is used of Potiphar's appointment of Joseph in Gen. 39:6, as the equivalent of *καθίστημι* (Gen. 39: 4), the latter being also the word used later of Pharaoh's action (Gen. 41: 41).

Even if we were to accept without question the various instances cited in the article of Paul Meyer in *Hermes*, XXXII, 231, n. 1, and those added by Stein in *Arch.*, IV, 151, n. 4, it would still be a fact that only in an extremely small number of cases in the literary sources is the prefect called *ἐπίτροπος*, and in the overwhelming majority of instances he is called *ἐπαρχος* or *ἡγεμών*. As for the inscriptions and papyri, the rendering is always *ἐπαρχος* or *ἡγεμών*. Consequently, any Alexandrian who read *ἐπίτροπος* would almost certainly have the inferior rank of *procurator* suggested to him, and not the prefect.

But in the first place the citations given by Professor Goodenough do not bear him out even for the limited use of *ἐπίτροπος* as the equivalent of *praefectus Aegypti*. Dio lxxviii. 21. 3, 4 (misquoted as lxxvii. 21 following the misprint in the *Archiv*) refers to Titianus, the prefect's deputy in Alexandria, who is quite properly called *ἐπίτροπος*. Dio often speaks of the prefect (lxxvi. 14. 15; lxxix. 25; lxxx. 2) and always as *ἐπαρχος* or *ἡγεμών*. Indeed Stein's article in the *Archiv* expressly states this. The other references from the Pap. Cataoui and the Mitteis-Wilcken *Chrestomathie* do not refer to the prefect at all, as far as they can be verified.

The instances cited by Meyer and Stein are easily explained with a loose use of *procurator*, much as we might use "governor" for any ruler. Indeed, in some of these very cases the word *ἐπίτροπος* is used with *ἡγεμών* and *ἐπαρχος*.

So far as the Dio passage is concerned, the effort to make Dio say what he patently does not say about a contemporary incident is surely futile. There is in fact no difficulty whatever if Titianus, as is likely, was a deputy who later was made prefect.

So far from having the *praefectus Aegypti* suggested to them, the Alexandrians when they read *ἐπίτροπος* would either understand it in its etymological sense or think of the much inferior rank of *procurator*, since in official language the Roman title of *procurator* was regularly rendered by *ἐπίτροπος*.

Professor Goodenough's versions of his text are sometimes curiously inept and seem to be based on rather hasty assumptions. For example, on page 5 we read: "They do not seem to perceive that they are not only like animals putting their necks under the yoke." This suggests that Philo makes the animals and the men who imitate them active agents in the yoking, which is the opposite of what the text states. The entire excerpt has similar infelicities. Clearly *ὅσον εἰώθε πνεῖν ἀνάγκη* is not well rendered by "how much has on occasion been blown in by necessity."

Professor Goodenough would be well advised to discard allegories except when Philo tells us that he is allegorizing, which is often enough. And I think he should equally discard his notion of a single, self-conscious Jewish state dispersed throughout the empire. All our data indicate that Jewish communities and individuals in the empire had little sense of solidarity. Their sentimental attachment to the Temple varied from devotion to complete indifference. Their participation in the community life of the places in which they resided was sometimes aloof and reluctant and sometimes amounted to wholehearted acceptance. And all degrees between these extremes were also represented.

There is much still to be done with Philo as a source for the history of his time. Professor Goodenough and his pupils can only be urged to continue their labors. The most promising method, however, will be to make Philo somewhat less complicated a person than this book is inclined to do.

MAX RADIN

University of California  
School of Jurisprudence  
Berkeley, California

---

*Three Roman Poets.* By F. A. WRIGHT. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1938. Pp. xi+268. \$2.65.

Professor Wright already has to his credit more than a dozen different titles, covering a wide range of topics in Greek and Latin literature. In this volume he returns to Plautus, Catullus, and Ovid and presents us with studies of the life, work, and times of the three poets, each complete in itself but forming with the other two a unified and extremely readable whole. To many readers on this side of the Atlantic, the phrase on the title-page,



"Formerly Professor of Classics in the University of London," will bring a shock of surprise and the hope that retirement in this case will only mean greater leisure for writing.

The publisher's jacket characterizes the authors selected for discussion as "the three most amusing of the Roman poets"; and Professor Wright's Preface says in justification of his choice, "In some moods laughter seems the greatest gift of heaven, and then we must turn to Plautus, Catullus, and Ovid. They write firstly to please themselves, and then to please their readers; moral uplift they leave to others; they are content if they make their readers smile."

The book is vigorous and interesting throughout. The three authors are flesh-and-blood men who move in actual time and space. Professor Wright draws a vivid picture of the marshes and the hill pastures around Sarsina, with their milk and cheese and dormice; of the "majestic sweep" of the Adige about Verona, the "smiling paradise of vineyards and olive groves, of mulberry trees and sweet-scented laurels," and the "great silver cup" of Lake Garda, with the snowy mountains forming its rim; and of the lovely valleys and cool streams of the limestone ridge near Sulmona. He makes one see the noisy and enthusiastic crowds packed together on the hillsides to witness a play of Plautus; the turbulent scenes in the senate house and on the streets of Rome in the last days of the Republic; and the contrast between the stern reformatory laws of Augustus and the gay life of the circle to which his daughter Julia belonged. The same vivid quality passes over into less promising sections of the work; and one finishes an account of the manuscript tradition of Catullus or Plautus or the "Fortleben" of Ovid, with a sense that here is something really exciting.

Each of the three studies includes a fairly full account of the author's work, with an estimate of his permanent worth. An attempt is made to arrange the plays of Plautus in chronological order, and a brief sketch of each is given, with comments on the dramatic technique, the use of lyric and dialogue meters, the humorous qualities in character, situation, or language, and the Roman elements introduced into plays like the *Amphitruo*. Professor Wright notes the similarities between the meters and rhymes of Plautus and those of medieval Latin verse (pp. 27-30) and remarks that Plautus views his rascals "with the same benevolent tolerance that the greatest English dramatist and the greatest English novelist extend to their less reputable creations" (p. 41). He discusses the various phases of Catullus' literary activity, with special attention to the relation between form and content and to the poet's right to the title *doctus*, and sums up his value for the modern world by saying, "It is in a few of Catullus' poems, better than in anything else in ancient literature, that we get the simple expression in musical language of personal feeling" (p. 170). He gives a valuable estimate of Ovid's work, bringing out the qualities that make him "a successful novelist" and "the greatest feminist of all Roman writers" (pp. 219-20). The points made are fully illustrated by quota-



tion—generally of both the Latin original and a verse translation. In the latter one is sometimes troubled by a departure from the Latin—it is a bit startling, for instance, to find Falernian wine introduced on page 113 after the third line of Catullus 50—but one can still pay a tribute to the grace and charm of these versions, their metrical skill, and their general fidelity to the mood of the original.

The book is so fine in many ways that it seems a pity to have to record inaccuracies. The proofreading is not above reproach; and after meeting *Venu* on page 182 and *matur* on page 255 one wonders whether the word order of the first line of Naevius' epitaph on page 24, together with the spelling *Mortalis immortalis*, may not be due to oversight, and whether "this importance" (p. 152) should not read "his."

More serious is the writer's tendency to state as facts (usually without qualification) hypotheses for which there is little or no evidence in ancient sources. To take one example from each of the three lives, the fact that the Umbrian Plautus was in the prime of his manhood in 216 B.C., when an army of allies was raised to fight against Hannibal, and that Umbria as a whole remained loyal to Rome, hardly warrants the statement that "for the next six years Plautus was probably in active service with the Roman armies in South Italy and Sicily" (p. 15); there is not the slightest evidence that Clodia accompanied her husband Metellus Celer when he went to Cisalpine Gaul as governor in 62 B.C. and that Catullus became acquainted with her in Verona (pp. 102, 132-34); and, whatever we may surmise about the reasons for Ovid's exile, the poet's own guarded statements do not allow us to assert that in his case "a double charge" was made, "his complicity in Julia's intrigue and the immoral character of his writings" (p. 215). Similarly, we cannot be sure of all the details of Catullus' voyage from Bithynia which Professor Wright gives on page 118, and, if the poet's own psychology counts for anything, we should probably place the lines written at his brother's grave on the outward journey rather than on the return. We know little enough about the history of Latin meters before the days of Plautus; but, in any case, when Cicero (*De sen.* vi. 20) has preserved for us two lines of Naevius in iambic octonarius, it is impossible to say that Plautus "invented" this meter (p. 26). The scene of Varro's activities in the Civil War was not southern Gaul (p. 109) but Further Spain (Caesar *BC* i. 38; ii. 17). Catullus' poems may have been published by Atticus, and there may have been two volumes with the contents that Professor Wright outlines on pages 114, 120, and 146; but, in the total absence of all evidence save references to a *libellus* and to the *passer Catulli*, such statements are bound to be tentative. And should not the phrase *sub modio* ("under a bushel") in Benevenuto de Campesanis' famous epigram about Catullus (p. 147) be taken in the figurative sense in which the words are used in the Vulgate text of Matt. 5:15, Mark 4:21, and Luke 11:33 rather than of a literal bushel-measure in a granary?

CORNELIA C. COULTER

Mount Holyoke College

*The Erythrae Decree: Contributions to the Early History of the Delian League and the Peloponnesian Confederacy.* By LEO INGEMANN HIGHBY. (*Klio*, Beiheft XXXVI, N.F., Heft 23.) Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1936. Pp. viii+108. Rm. 6.50 (bound, 8.00).

This study raises a number of questions of importance for the history of the Peloponnesian and Delian leagues. The Erythrae decree with *IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 12/13a is reconstructed as a stoichedon inscription with forty-seven letters to the line. The result is a considerable change in the wording but not so much in the general meaning of the document. More radical are some of the new theories connected with its interpretation. It is dated in the early or middle sixties of the fifth century and is interpreted as a decree voted by Athens not after a revolt of Erythrae but when the city first joined the Delian League. "Erythrae was, at the time of the enactment of this decree, regarded and treated as a member of the League, possessed of equal rights and privileges with Athens and the others" (p. 23). In this connection the actual limitations should be given more careful consideration. The internal affairs of Erythrae are regulated by an Athenian decree, a garrison is stationed in the city, Athens appears as the predominant partner in the oath of allegiance to the League, and in the fragmentary inscription joined to the decree, if this is correctly restored, Erythrae is pledged to obedience to Athens (p. 26). The city, no doubt, was "free," for greater restrictions than this could be reconciled with "freedom." Thus, if Highby's dating is correct, the document is valuable chiefly as showing how soon Athens began to increase her power and to transform the League. Disagreement with the author on this point by no means implies a general condemnation of his thoughtful and valuable work. His criticism of Schaefer's *Staatsform und Politik* (reviewed *Class. Phil.*, XXVIII [1933], 320-22) is sound, and his study of the chronology of the early pentecontaetia valuable. In the proofreading and technique there is room for improvement.

J. A. O. LARSEN

University of Chicago

---

*Early Greek Elegists.* By C. M. BOWRA. ("Martin Classical Lectures," Vol. VII.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Press, 1938. Pp. 208.

In his first chapter, "Origins and Beginnings," Bowra deals with the elegies of Archilochus, Callinus, Mimnermus, and Semonides. Chapters follow on Tyrtaeus, Solon, Xenophanes, Theognis, and "Simonides and the Sepulchral Epigram." The author is at his best in his last chapter, and that best is very good indeed. I find it hard to believe, however, that a Greek could have taken *Λακεδαιμονίων ῥήμασι πευθόμενοι* to mean anything but what Cicero says more explicitly: "sacris patriae legibus obsequimur." Simonides would hardly say *ῥήτραις*, and he uses a vaguer term that suggests it. That Spartans

obeyed no master but only law was a proud boast. Law was the voice of the fatherland, and a word of the fatherland was law.

Bowra has here a less interesting field than in his *Greek Lyric Poetry*, and one that he has not made his own to the same extent. Nor is novelty to be expected in public lectures in a well-worked field. It is enough that the subject is presented with clarity and judgment. Archilochus is dated by the eclipse of 711 B.C. rather than by that of 648; in the case of Theognis only verses addressed to Cyrnus by name are mentioned. There are many quotations in Greek; translations in verse from *The Oxford Book of Greek Verse in Translation* are appended where they exist. Elsewhere Bowra renders the sense accurately and, if sometimes prosaically, no more so than the original. He succeeds especially well with Simonides. Verse translation is likely to be vague. Solon says of the rich that he contrived to save their face: *καὶ τοῖς ἐφρασάμην μηδὲν αἰεὶς ἔχειν*. In Highet's version this becomes, "I bade them have their due and be content." Linforth's prose is exact: "careful that they too should suffer no indignity."

There is no bibliography. Notes and index are barely adequate. In one case (Mimnermus fr. 13) the text of E. Diehl (Bowra says H. Diehl) is printed (but *ἐπ'* for *ἐτ'* in l. 9), but Bowra translates the text of Hudson-Williams, which differs sufficiently to present quite a puzzle. There is a good puzzle in the reference to "Aristot. fr. 263" in the note on page 131. I looked first in Rose's edition of the fragments of Aristotle and wasted some time before I discovered a clue in the Firmin-Didot *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum*. In any case the reference should have been to Diogenes Laertius, for the statement in the text that a son of Empedocles triumphed in wrestling at Olympia comes from Satyrus, not Aristotle; and Diogenes cites both. It is a good book, but some niceties are scamped. There are practically no misprints, and the mistaken accents are limited to the last chapter: *γαῖ'* (p. 173), *ὠψήλους* (p. 174), and *τηιδε* (pp. 175 and 193).

L. A. POST

Haverford College

---

*Die interpolierte Recension des Terenztextes*. By PETER FEHL. ("Neue deutsche Forschungen": Abteilung *Klassische Philologie*, Band IX.) Berlin: Junker & Dünhaupt Verlag, 1938. Pp. 152. Rm. 6.50, unbound.

In the present work, originally a doctoral dissertation written at Cologne under the direction of Günther Jachmann, the author amplifies some of Jachmann's previously published views on the text of Terence (*Die Geschichte des Terenztextes im Altertum* [Rekt. Progr.; Basel, 1924]; *Terentius: Codex Vaticanus Latinus 3868 . . . phototypice editus . . .* [Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1929]; the article "Terentius" in *Real-Encyclopädie der kl. Altertumswissenschaft*, II. Reihe, Band 5). His purpose is twofold: to point out bot

the character and the date of the Calliopian recension (here called  $\omega$ ; this is the "interpolierte Recension").

The character of  $\omega$ , he claims (p. 12), is aptly described by Jachmann (*Die Geschichte, etc.*, p. 120): "Die interpolierte Recension ist dadurch entstanden, dass ein Exemplar der Bembinus-Klasse einer Textrevision unterworfen wurde von Seiten eines Bearbeiters, der sich dabei teils von der eigenen Willkür teils von einem oder mehreren minderwertigen populären Texten leiten liess." W. M. Lindsay, he continues (p. 12), is completely wrong in the following explanation (*CQ*, XIX [1925], 34): "I strongly suspect that Calliopius handed to a pupil his own lecture text . . . , and that the pupil was left alone to frame the edition. . . . On the young knave . . . lies the guilt. He mistook for variant readings or emendations the explanatory words written between the lines in the lecture text. . . . And Jovialis has much to answer for, who defaces the Bembinus text with these glosses which reduce Terence's verse to prose and overload the terse conversational diction of the Roman Menander." Equally wrong, Fehl holds (pp. 12-13), is J. D. Craig (*Ancient Editions of Terence* [Oxford University Press, 1929]; see also *Jovialis and the Calliopian Text of Terence* [Oxford University Press, 1927]),<sup>2</sup> who, in championing Lindsay's explanation, sets  $\omega$  at the beginning of the Middle Ages and attacks the conception of two contemporary editions of Terence ( $A^3$  and  $\omega$ ) in earlier times: "In reality, it appears, there was only one 'ancient' edition of Terence, the edition which Codex Bembinus, with all its inaccuracy, preserves" (*Ancient Ed.*, p. 130).

Fehl finds (pp. 136-37) that the editors of  $\omega$  had three chief motives in mind in making their "Interpolationen": (1) an attempt to make the text more easily comprehensible for superficial readers by the completion of elliptical expressions or by the changing of the syntax of verbs or nouns to make it conform with the usage of school grammar or the ordinary speech of the time; (2) an effort to eliminate supposed roughness in a series of several sentences or in smaller groups of words by the use of assimilation; and (3) a desire to amplify and enrich the text by the introduction of arbitrary and almost capricious changes. He takes up the greater part of his book with a methodical and detailed account of the fourteen types of "Interpolationen"<sup>4</sup> to which these motives gave rise.

<sup>1</sup>  $\Sigma$  in the Oxford text of Lindsay-Kauer;  $\varsigma$  in Jachmann, *Die Geschichte, etc.*;  $Z'$  in L. W. Jones and C. R. Morey, *The Miniatures of the MSS. of Terence Prior to the Thirteenth Century* (Princeton, 1931).

<sup>2</sup> Fehl does not cite the following articles by Craig, all of which reach the same general conclusions as does *Ancient Ed.*, etc.: "Priscian's Quotations from Terence," *CQ*, XXIV (1930), 65-73; "Terence Quotations in Servius," *ibid.*, pp. 183-87; "Terence Quotations in Servius Auctus," *ibid.*, XXV (1931), 151-55.

<sup>3</sup>  $A$  = the Bembine manuscript.

<sup>4</sup> For a list see his Table of Contents.

He points out, moreover, that the changes in  $\omega$ , though more numerous, are of the same character as those in A and  $\Phi^5$  (the common archetype of A and  $\omega$ ); that the changes in all three manuscripts are merely the manifestation of "eine allgemein verbreitete, im Prinzip einheitliche Änderungstendenz" (p. 134)—a tendency which appears as well in Plautus' comedies,<sup>6</sup> in Seneca's tragedies, in the satires of Juvenal and Persius, and in Martial's epigrams<sup>7</sup> (pp. 133-34; cf. pp. 14-16). Now Lindsay and Craig misunderstand the real nature of  $\omega$  (pp. 134-36). They overlook certain phenomena that cannot be due to the interpolation of glosses mistaken for variant readings or emendations; to cite specific examples, they overlook (1) the addition of words to enrich the text, (2) the completion of abbreviated formulas, and (3) the interpolation of the interjections *hem*, *pol*, and *hercle*.<sup>8</sup>

Scholars will be grateful for FehI's careful description of the interpolations in  $\omega$ , A, and  $\Phi$ , whether or not they agree with him concerning the character of these manuscripts. One may well agree, I believe, that A was not necessarily a superior and "standard" text and the only "ancient" edition (p. 143 and n. 17).<sup>9</sup> On the other hand, one need not feel that the phenomena described by FehI, despite his enthusiastic presentation, exclude the possibility that the interpolations in  $\omega$  were due in large part to the mistaking of interlinear explanations for variant readings or corrections. A third possibility is suggested by Pasquali.<sup>10</sup> In the present state of our knowledge one's interpretation is likely to be highly subjective. The truth of the matter is still to be determined.

The date of  $\omega$ , according to FehI, is ca. 300, though it still needs to be determined within narrower limits (pp. 137-38; cf. pp. 15-16). This date is chosen (p. 142) because A.D. 250-350 is the period to which Leo (*Plaut. Forsch.*<sup>2</sup> [1912], pp. 50 and 60) attributes both editions of Plautus, the Calliopian

<sup>5</sup> Z in Jones-Morey, *The Miniatures, etc.* The changes in  $\Phi$  and A are in fact considered by FehI as completely as possible, those in  $\omega$  (and its descendants  $\delta$  and  $\gamma$ ) less completely.

<sup>6</sup> With some differences (p. 133). As FehI points out (p. 14), the text of Plautus is not an exact parallel because the Ambrosian palimpsest is itself the descendant of an interpolated archetype.

<sup>7</sup> Examples are given for all the authors in this list.

<sup>8</sup> Five additional instances of various types of change are also listed (p. 135).

<sup>9</sup> L. W. Jones, "Ancient Texts of Terence," *CP*, XXV (1930), 327.

<sup>10</sup> G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo* (Florence: Felice le Monnier, 1934), pp. 366-67: "Ma è in sè possibile che Callipio abbia adoprato un discendente di  $\Phi$  già sfigurato da corrotte e da intrusioni di lezioni volgari. Una scoperta recente [the palimpsest fragment, St. Gall 912, described in the second paragraph below] mostra, secondo me, ch'è veramente così; mostra che l'attività di Callipio consistè, come conviene a un uomo del V secolo, proprio nell'aggiunta di quei glossemi, di quelle parolette che rendono più chiaro il senso, ma, spesso, mandano in malora il verso."

recension of Terence, and the interpolated version of Seneca's tragedies; in this period there was apparently a general tendency to interpolate texts.<sup>11</sup>

Wessner, however, maintains (*Gnomon*, III [1927], 344)<sup>12</sup> that the neglect of meter in  $\omega$  prevents the existence of this recension before the fifth century, for it is not until this century that one meets with expressions that directly<sup>13</sup> or indirectly<sup>14</sup> turn to the view that Terence's plays were not written in verse. But Fehl immediately points out (pp. 139-40) that the meter is neglected *before* the fifth century in A, in the St. Gall fragment (once only), in  $\Phi$  (middle of s. iii, according to Jachmann and Fehl), in two Terentian citations in Servius' commentary on the *Aeneid*, in four citations by Nonius, and in five citations by Donatus. This evidence is not as imposing as it seems at first glance. A is generally considered to be s. iv-v, and even Fehl, who calls it definitely s. iv, says (p. 137): "Dieser Vorbehalt muss gemacht werden mit Rücksicht darauf, dass den aus der älteren Majuskel gewonnenen Datierungen eine starke Unsicherheit anhaftet." The evidence of the St. Gall fragment is hardly conclusive.<sup>15</sup> Strangely enough, Fehl gives no examples for  $\Phi$ .<sup>16</sup> The examples in Servius can best be judged after the authenticity of the various parts of his commentaries has been decided by the editors of the forthcoming edition.<sup>17</sup> Nonius may have lived at any time between ca. A.D. 150 and ca. A.D. 500.<sup>18</sup> There is a complete lack of evidence that our extant commentary of Donatus (reduced and composite as it is) is pre-Carolingian.<sup>19</sup>

Fehl's date for  $\omega$ , then, falls back upon the fact that there was a general tendency to interpolate texts ca. 300. I must confess surprise at his utter neglect of the evidence of the Terence miniatures as set forth in 1931 by

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Jachmann, *Real-Enc.*, p. 648, and *Die Geschichte*, etc., p. 84. But Plautus is not an exact parallel (Fehl, p. 14), and the interpolated version of Seneca belongs to s. v (Pasquali, *op. cit.*, p. 368).

<sup>12</sup> So also Craig, *Ancient Ed.*, etc., p. 5, and Pasquali, *op. cit.*, pp. 339 and 365.

<sup>13</sup> Priscian *De metr. Ter.* (in *Grammatici Latini*) iii. 418. 8.

<sup>14</sup> Rufinus (in *Grammatici Latini*) vi. 565. 1.

<sup>15</sup> The palimpsest fragment (St. Gall 912) of *Heaut.* 857-63 and 875-78 is of s. iv and probably older than A. See P. Lehmann, *S.B. Münch. Akad., Phil.-hist. Kl.* (1931), Heft 1, p. 9. Craig (*CR*, XLV [1931], 215) claims that the fragment has no meaning for the text tradition. For the opposite view cf. Jachmann, *Real-Enc.*, etc., "Terentius," p. 648. Pasquali (*op. cit.*, p. 367) uses the fragment as partial evidence to justify dating the Calliopian recension in s.v.

<sup>16</sup> Though he states that many could be given, Fehl's arbitrary date for  $\Phi$  may possibly be far too early.

<sup>17</sup> E. K. Rand, J. J. Savage, H. T. Smith, and G. B. Waldrop. The first volume will appear in 1939.

<sup>18</sup> See my article, "Ancient Texts of Terence," *CP*, XXV (1930), 323-24.

<sup>19</sup> Löfstedt, "Die Bembinusscholien und Donatus," *Eranos*, XII (1912), 43. See also Lindsay, *CQ*, XX (1926), 103-5; Craig, *Jovialis*, etc., p. vi; and cf. J. D. Mountford, *The Scholia Bemina* (Liverpool: University Press, 1934), pp. 119-25.



Morey and myself (*The Miniatures, etc.*), particularly since Jachmann realizes the value of a consideration of the miniatures and since our views have been generally approved by scholars (with only one exception, to the best of my knowledge).<sup>20</sup> To be sure, he does mention in a note (n. 10 on pp. 138-39)<sup>21</sup> the generally acknowledged fact that the miniatures were completed for a  $\gamma$ -text. Perhaps he infers thereby that the miniatures are of no value in determining the date of  $\omega$ . But here he errs. If  $\gamma$  was written in the fifth century (and this is the testimony of the miniatures),<sup>22</sup>  $\omega$  (its immediate ancestor) was probably written not long before, certainly not as early as ca. 300. When the evidence of the text is so confused, "es zeigt sich hier," as Seel says (*Gnomon*, XII [1936], 16 ff.), "die Fruchtbarkeit kunstgeschichtlicher Betrachtung." Without a perfect combination of textual criticism, paleography, history, and art

<sup>20</sup> Our views have been accepted by Lindsay, Wessner, Olga Dobias-Rožděstvenskaja, Craig (*CR*, XLVI [1932], 221-22), S. Reinach (*Rev. archéol.*, XXV [1932], 350), W. Köhler (*Kulturwissenschaftliche Bibliographie zum Nachleben der Antike*, I [London: Bibliothek Warburg, 1934], 82-83), C. H. Beeson (*CP*, XXIX [1934], 74-75), and others. G. Pasquali (*op. cit.*) has been unable to consult our book (p. 362 and n. 1), but he is familiar (p. 364) with Morey's article in *Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia*, IV (1926), 36 ff., and accepts the stylistic comparisons there adduced for our dating; he says (p. 362): "E evidente che, per risolvere la questione della datazione della recensione calliopiana, bisogna prima aver determinato in che relazione stiano le illustrazioni con il testo dei codici che le contengono." O. Seel (*Gnomon*, XII [1936], 16 ff.) similarly appreciates the import which the miniatures have for the text. So far as I know, the only scholar not to accept all of our views is A. Boeckler (*Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, LIII [1932], 1269), who feels that our stylistic parallels adduced to fix the date of  $\gamma$ <sup>2</sup> are not convincing, but who does accept some of our views concerning the nature of F, etc. Boeckler's strictures against our conclusions are based on the improbability of a Greek artist for the Vatican Terence and the likelihood that the Vatican Vergil and the Quedlinburg Itala belong to the second half of the fourth century. Since the publication of Boeckler's review De Wit has dated the Vatican Vergil, very securely in our opinion, in the fifth century on the basis of the style of the miniatures. Critics of the late Antique in general are now agreed that the nave mosaics of S. Maria Maggiore belong to the fifth century and not to the second half of the fourth as Boeckler thought when he used the date of the mosaics as a basis on which to establish the date of the Quedlinburg Itala. In addition, numerous scholars have demonstrated within the last seven years the extensive Eastern Greek influence on Latin art at the end of the fourth century and through the fifth (cf., e.g., Marion Lawrence on Early Christian sarcophagi). We doubt, therefore, if Boeckler would be so much impressed now with the improbability of a Greek artist's working on the Vatican Terence. His statement that the same formulas can be found in Latin works merely means that he has considered as "Latin" a number of monuments which would now be considered Latin under strong oriental influence or else out-and-out Eastern; his arguments, in other words, are now out of date.

<sup>21</sup> In this note he strongly upbraids O. Seel (*Gnomon*, XII [1936], 16 ff.) for his remarks that Pasquali (*op. cit.*) disagrees strongly with Jachmann and that the study of the Terence miniatures has brought about "ein erstaunlicher Gewinn." On pp. 11-12 Fehl mentions our work (and its dating of  $\omega$ ), but does not discuss it.

<sup>22</sup> Jones-Morey, *op. cit.*, pp. 200-201; cf. our "Conclusions" (pp. 195-221) throughout.



the study of manuscripts is likely to be fruitless. With such a combination, on the other hand, considerable progress has already been made for such manuscripts as those of Tours (by Rand, Köhler, *et al.*), for Swiss manuscripts in general (by Bruckner), and for manuscripts which contain canon tables (by Nordenfalk). It is to be hoped that Fehl will take this fact into account in the further investigation which he promises.<sup>23</sup>

*College of the City of New York*

LESLIE WEBBER JONES

---

*Hippokrates: Über Entstehung und Aufbau des menschlichen Körpers* (ΠΕΡΙ ΣΑΡΚΩΝ). Übersetzt und kommentiert von KARL DEICHGRÄBER, mit einem sprachwissenschaftlichen Beitrag von EDUARD SCHWYZER. In Gemeinschaft mit den Mitgliedern des philologischen Proseminars Berlin herausgegeben. Leipzig and Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1935. Pp. xviii+97.

This edition of one of the less-known treatises of the Hippocratic Corpus, namely, the treatise which is commonly called ΠΕΡΙ ΣΑΡΚΩΝ, is really much more than a new edition of this fragment and a commentary upon it. Professor Deichgräber is *Ordentlicher* professor of classical philology at the University of Göttingen; he has published this little pamphlet under his own name but tells us in his Preface that he used this particular Hippocratic treatise as the material for his pro-seminar during the winter semester of 1933-34. Apparently, he divided up the critical and textual work between his students, retaining for himself the German translation and the section that deals with the author of the treatise and his ideas. The little book is a very definite proof that the philological student of today has not lost, at least in Germany, the ability to produce real textual criticism. Apparently, he can still approach a problem of this kind with the zeal and the determination of his predecessors and can prove that he is the heir to their powers inherited from the period of philological detail work that made German philology so renowned in the old days.

This writer has not space to go into a detailed review of this valuable edition. As a matter of fact, the material for a critical edition of ΠΕΡΙ ΣΑΡΚΩΝ is very slight, since this treatise is not known to us through ancient commentaries or Arabic translations and its text depends entirely upon manuscripts, of which the oldest (Vaticanus 276) belongs only to the twelfth century. ΠΕΡΙ ΣΑΡΚΩΝ is not quoted anywhere in the entire medical literature of the ancients, not even by Galen. In the lexicographer Erotian there are possibly some words that may have reference to this treatise.

Like so many other Hippocratic books, this treatise is a fragment. It evidently belonged to a much longer treatise that dealt with the general develop-

<sup>23</sup> A perusal of the forthcoming edition of Servius and further study of the real nature of Donatus, among other things, ought to be of great assistance.

ment of mankind. The title *Περὶ σαρκῶν* is misleading. It was probably put at the head of the treatise by some Alexandrian librarian who was cataloguing it with other medical books and who did not read it through. Deichgräber translates *Περὶ σαρκῶν* as "Über die Muskeln." However, in the body of the work there is hardly any mention of the muscles, and the writer, in the first section, says himself that he intends not to discuss muscles but to show how mankind originated: what is the fundamental nature of the soul, what is the general idea of health and of sickness and of death, and finally what things are useful and what are harmful to the internal elements of the human body. The writer believes that the concept of warmth is the fundamental element in life and that whatever tends to change this concept of warmth has definite influence on health and sickness. He divides the concept of life into four different elements: first, warmth, or "ether" as the ancients called it; then earth, which is cold and dry; third, air, which is warm and moist; and, fourth, the air that is nearest to earth and which is a very moist and thick substance.

After this introduction the writer discusses various parts of the human body as, for instance, the brain, the internal organs, the liver, the spleen; as well as the power of sight, of speech, etc. The last section is devoted to the "law of life and death" which completes itself in man in seven days or periods. Most of this material, according to the writer, is material that he has assimilated from ancient authors. He says that at the end of his treatise he will put forward some of his own ideas. This, however, he does not do. Probably these ideas of his own were continued in the part of the treatise that is not preserved, as *Περὶ σαρκῶν* ends rather abruptly after the discussion of the "law of life and death" and its connection with numerical ideas.

The work of Professor Deichgräber and his "wackere studenten" is a very welcome contribution to our knowledge of Greek medicine.

JOHN RATHBONE OLIVER

*Johns Hopkins University*

---

*Démosthènes et la fin de la démocratie athénienne.* By Paul Cloché. Paris: Payot, 1937. Pp. 333+map. Fr. 36.

Had a movement been started to draft some scholar to write a general work on Demosthenes, the choice of many would have fallen upon Professor Cloché, whose earlier studies in this field make him a logical person to perform the task. In the present book his admirers will not be disappointed. After a concise introductory chapter stating the position of Athens in 354 (one of the best parts of the work), the author traces the various periods of Demosthenes' life and work from infancy to death, concluding with a general estimate of the man and his career. In general, the book is a very able defense of one whom the writer regards as an "habile et prévoyant homme d'Etat." Although Professor Cloché is well at home in the literature of his subject and cites an ample bibliography, the references in the text are limited almost entirely to the

ancient sources; the moderns usually appear only as *on*. This relative freedom from annotation, despite its possible drawbacks, combines with the author's clear style to produce a very readable book. On the other hand, the author is usually careful to indicate other points of view lest the uninformed assume that the place of Demosthenes or the history of the fourth century is as plain as the narrative makes them.

One point open to criticism is the attempt to claim general Panhellenic interest for Demosthenes (pp. 312-14). Professor Cloché has defended Demosthenes as a statesman and patriot throughout his career; it is too bad that the author, after praising the champion of the city-state, has sought to make him also a Panhellenist. In a book almost contemporary with Cloché's, Professor Jaeger has occupied what is, I believe, the only tenable position for one who would make Demosthenes a Panhellenist: by the time of the *Third Philippic* the orator developed a Panhellenic viewpoint which was a complete change from his earlier attitude. Even this position would, in my opinion, be stronger had not Demosthenes used Panhellenic appeal in earlier speeches where his purpose was admittedly not of this sort; hence, this later Panhellenism, even though apparently consistent at this period, has a suspicious look. In any case, a claim for general Panhellenic policy on the part of Demosthenes seems ill-founded.

The printer has displayed considerable ingenuity in omitting, inverting, and generally confounding letters. It is unfortunate that these eccentricities remain to mar slightly this book which has much to recommend it and which that deified abstraction, the general reader, will enjoy as well as the specialist.

HAROLD B. DUNKEL

*University of Chicago*

---

*Plotinus Schriften.* Translated by RICHARD HARDER. 5 vols. Leipzig: Meiner, 1930-37. Pp. xi+198; 207; 197; 204; vii+202. Paper, Rm. 44.30; cloth, Rm. 51.50.

A full appreciation of Professor Harder's work on Plotinus, of which this translation is one result, and indeed a full appreciation of the translation itself must await the appearance of the volumes of notes which he promises us. The translation does not follow in detail any of the published texts but clearly implies a recension by Harder himself. Indeed, it is implied in the Preface that, at any rate, one main purpose of the translation is to contribute to the production of a satisfactory text by showing where emendation seems necessary and, more important perhaps for some modern scholars, where it does not. To serve this purpose, a translation must keep very closely to the form of the original and not indulge in the paraphrases and loosenesses of other modern translators of Plotinus. In this Harder is remarkably successful, and withal his translation makes very clear and, considering the difficulties of Plotinus, very easy reading.

As an illustration of these qualities we may look at a passage chosen more or less at random (*Enn.* vi. i. 22, ll. 10–18):<sup>1</sup>

So wird denn derselbe Vollzug in einem bestimmten Verhältnis ein Tun, in einem andern ein Leiden. Wenn man ihn von diesem Ding her betrachtet, ist er Tun, und wenn von jenem, Leiden, weil jenes Objekt in bestimmte Verfassung versetzt wird, wobei es sich um eine und dieselbe Bewegung handelt. Mithin hat es den Anschein dass beide *zuerst* sind, soweit das Tun *zu* dem Leiden ist, indem derselbe Vollzug, wenn er von diesem aus betrachtet wird, Tun ist, und von jenem aus Leiden; jedes von beiden wird dabei nicht an sich allein betrachtet, sondern jeweils in Verbindung mit dem Tuenden oder Leidenden; "dieser bewegt und dieser wird bewegt" und das sind jedesmal zwei Kategorien.

Harder here admirably reproduces not only the meaning but also the form of the Greek. Or look at *Enn.* iv. i. 20 ff.: "Denn indem sie sich in den ganzen Körper hineingibt, bleibt sie ungeteilt sofern sie ganz in den ganzen Körper tritt, geteilt aber dadurch dass sie an jeder Körperstelle ist."<sup>2</sup>

The instances where Harder's translation is clearly correct as against those of his two most recent predecessors are very numerous. That in itself is a negative contribution to the reconstruction of the text. But Harder's contribution to this reconstruction can be seen most clearly in those cases where emendations have already been proposed, but his translation shows that the manuscript text is satisfactory. For example, in *Enn.* vi. i. 12, ll. 29 ff., we have the words ἡ μὲν διατιθεῖσι [sc. αἱ τέχναι] τὴν ψυχὴν, ποιότητες, ἡ δὲ ποιούσι, ποιητικαὶ καὶ τοῦτο πρὸς ἄλλο καὶ πρὸς τι . . . , Ἀρ' οὖν ἄλλη τις ὑπόστασις κατὰ τὸ ποιητικὸν τοῦ ποιητικ(οῦ) [Mss-ὄν] οὐκ ἄλλου τινὸς ὄντος ἢ καθ' ὅσον ποιόν; MacKenna (1930) translated the second sentence: "Can it then be held that there is any distinct reality implied in activity, seeing that the active is something distinct only according as it is a quale?" Bréhier (1936), presumably with the objections to this rendering in view, punctuated ὄντος; "Ἡ καθ' ὅσον ποιόν, and translated: "L'être apte à agir a-t-il donc une autre réalité

<sup>1</sup> (The last figures in the references to the *Enneads* refer to the lines of Bréhier's edition.) The text here is: *Γίνεται τὸνν τὸ αὐτὸ ἐν σχέσει τινὶ ποιεῖν, ἐν ἄλλῃ δὲ πάσχειν. παρὰ μὲν γὰρ τῷδε θεωρούμενον ποιεῖν ἔσται, κίνησις οὕσα ἡ αὐτή, παρὰ δὲ τῷδε πάσχειν, οὗ τὰδε οὕτως διατίθεται, ὥστε κινδυνεύειν ἀμφω πρὸς τι εἶναι, ὅσα τοῦ ποιεῖν πρὸς τὸ πάσχειν [εἰ μὲν παρὰ τούτῳ, τὸ αὐτὸ ποιεῖν, εἰ δὲ παρὰ τῷδε, πάσχειν], καὶ θεωρούμενον ἑκάτερον οὐ καθ' αὐτὸ, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τοῦ ποιούντος καὶ πάσχοντος οὗτος κινεῖ καὶ οὗτος κινεῖται καὶ δύο κατηγορίαι ἑκάτερον.* MacKenna's version is: "Thus, what is Action in one relation may be Passion in another. One same motion will be Action from the point of view of A, Passion from that of B; for the two are so disposed that they might well be consigned to the category of Relation—at any rate in the cases where the Action entails a corresponding Passion: neither correlative is found in isolation; each involves both Action and Passion, though A acts as mover and B is moved: each then involves two categories." I have italicized the words which definitely misrepresent the Greek; but, even apart from these, it is obvious how much more closely Harder's version follows the original.

<sup>2</sup> *Εἰς ὅλον γὰρ τὸ σῶμα δοῦσα αὐτὴν, μὴ μερισθεῖσα τῷ ὅλῳ εἰς ὅλον, τῷ ἐν παντὶ εἶναι μεμείρισται.* Bréhier's version is: "En effet elle se donne au corps tout entier; toute entière dans le corps tout entier, elle y est sans partage; mais parce qu'elle est en tout corps, elle est partagée."

que celle d'un relatif, réalité correspondante à son aptitude, sans rapport à autre chose [*sic!*]?"—Oui, en tant que qualité." Harder, however, shows by his translation that the manuscript punctuation is satisfactory: "Hat denn aber der Träger kraft der Fähigkeit zum Tun, obgleich der zum Tun Befähigte kein anderer ist, eine andre Existenz als kraft seiner Eigenschaft als Wiebeschaffenes?" Or again in the difficult passage *Enn.* vi. vii. 7, ll. 24 ff., his rendering shows that Bréhier's recourse to emendation is unnecessary.<sup>3</sup>

But it is not only in this negative way that Harder's translation contributes to the reconstruction of the text; there are many places where he is obviously translating some new emendation. But a proper consideration of his activity in this respect must await the appearance of his volumes of notes. We may, however, refer by way of illustration to two places in *Enn.* iv: (1) iii. 1. 12 he supposes (with Gollwitzer) a lacuna after *θεαμάτων* which he fills up thus: "(so müssen wir wissen was das Schauende ist. . . . *Es nimmt einerseits das Göttliche bei sich auf, anderseits ist es dem Leibe zugewandt*)" [gap and italics both his]; (2) iii. 9. 28, where the manuscripts have *τὸ λεγόμενον, ἀμυδρὸν ἐν ἀμυδρῷ τῷ γενομένῳ*, he seems to emend *λεγόμενον* to *γενόμενον* (unnecessarily, in the opinion of the present reviewer).

The translation has very few faults. Frequently, of course, one feels inclined to the reconstruction of the text; there are many places where he is obviously translating some new emendation. But a proper consideration of his activity in this respect must await the appearance of his volumes of notes. We may, however, refer by way of illustration to two places in *Enn.* iv: (1) iii. 1. 12 he supposes (with Gollwitzer) a lacuna after *θεαμάτων* which he fills up thus: "(so müssen wir wissen was das Schauende ist. . . . *Es nimmt einerseits das Göttliche bei sich auf, anderseits ist es dem Leibe zugewandt*)" [gap and italics both his]; (2) iii. 9. 28, where the manuscripts have *τὸ λεγόμενον, ἀμυδρὸν ἐν ἀμυδρῷ τῷ γενομένῳ*, he seems to emend *λεγόμενον* to *γενόμενον* (unnecessarily, in the opinion of the present reviewer).

The translation has very few faults. Frequently, of course, one feels inclined to the reconstruction of the text; there are many places where he is obviously translating some new emendation. But a proper consideration of his activity in this respect must await the appearance of his volumes of notes. We may, however, refer by way of illustration to two places in *Enn.* iv: (1) iii. 1. 12 he supposes (with Gollwitzer) a lacuna after *θεαμάτων* which he fills up thus: "(so müssen wir wissen was das Schauende ist. . . . *Es nimmt einerseits das Göttliche bei sich auf, anderseits ist es dem Leibe zugewandt*)" [gap and italics both his]; (2) iii. 9. 28, where the manuscripts have *τὸ λεγόμενον, ἀμυδρὸν ἐν ἀμυδρῷ τῷ γενομένῳ*, he seems to emend *λεγόμενον* to *γενόμενον* (unnecessarily, in the opinion of the present reviewer).

The translation has very few faults. Frequently, of course, one feels inclined to the reconstruction of the text; there are many places where he is obviously translating some new emendation. But a proper consideration of his activity in this respect must await the appearance of his volumes of notes. We may, however, refer by way of illustration to two places in *Enn.* iv: (1) iii. 1. 12 he supposes (with Gollwitzer) a lacuna after *θεαμάτων* which he fills up thus: "(so müssen wir wissen was das Schauende ist. . . . *Es nimmt einerseits das Göttliche bei sich auf, anderseits ist es dem Leibe zugewandt*)" [gap and italics both his]; (2) iii. 9. 28, where the manuscripts have *τὸ λεγόμενον, ἀμυδρὸν ἐν ἀμυδρῷ τῷ γενομένῳ*, he seems to emend *λεγόμενον* to *γενόμενον* (unnecessarily, in the opinion of the present reviewer).

The translation has very few faults. Frequently, of course, one feels inclined to the reconstruction of the text; there are many places where he is obviously translating some new emendation. But a proper consideration of his activity in this respect must await the appearance of his volumes of notes. We may, however, refer by way of illustration to two places in *Enn.* iv: (1) iii. 1. 12 he supposes (with Gollwitzer) a lacuna after *θεαμάτων* which he fills up thus: "(so müssen wir wissen was das Schauende ist. . . . *Es nimmt einerseits das Göttliche bei sich auf, anderseits ist es dem Leibe zugewandt*)" [gap and italics both his]; (2) iii. 9. 28, where the manuscripts have *τὸ λεγόμενον, ἀμυδρὸν ἐν ἀμυδρῷ τῷ γενομένῳ*, he seems to emend *λεγόμενον* to *γενόμενον* (unnecessarily, in the opinion of the present reviewer).

M. J. BOYD

Queen's University  
Belfast

<sup>3</sup> ἐκεῖνα γὰρ τὰ αἰσθητὰ, ἃ οὕτως ὠνομάσαμεν, ὅτι ἀσώματα, ἄλλον τρόπον ἐν ἀντιλήψει, καὶ τῇδε τὴν αἴσθησιν ἀμυδροτέραν οὖσαν τῆς ἐκεῖ ἀντιλήψεως, ἣν ὠνομάζομεν αἴσθησιν, ὅτι σωματῶν ἦν, ἐναργεστέραν εἶναι. Harder translates: "Die Wahrnehmungsdinge dort, die wir so nannten weil sie unkörperlich, in anderm Sinne aber doch einem Erfassen zugänglich sind; und diese Wahrnehmung hier, welche trüber ist als das Erfassen dort oben—von der wir freilich glauben sie sei, weil sie sich auf Körper bezieht, die klarere Wahrnehmung."

*The Periclean Entrance Court of the Acropolis of Athens.* By GORHAM P. STEVENS. (Published for the American School of Archaeology at Athens.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936. Pp. ix+78. \$2.50. (Also published in *Hesperia*, V, No. 4 [1936], 443-520.)

In this study Mr. Stevens gleans on the summit of the Acropolis rock and reaps a harvest very worth while indeed. Puzzling over the desperately slim remains of many buildings and monuments, he attempts to discover what may be known about the great array of structures which constituted the monumental environment of the greatest architectural achievements of Periclean culture, located on the Hill of Athena. The present study is built around the path of Pausanias and concerns itself most directly with the ceremonial approach to the Parthenon and with the other monuments which met the eye of the ancient traveler entering the area through the Propylaea. His work is summarized in a restored perspective view of the Acropolis from the door-wall of the Propylaea (frontispiece) and a restored plan (Fig. 66); from these one quickly and readily appreciates the main values of the work. The first of these is that he presents a picture of the buildings and surroundings which is in all probability substantially correct (however tentative as to detail) but which must alter materially the ordinary concept of the situation. The second value, of perhaps even greater importance to students, is that he has examined and described a large group of the rock cuttings which so bewilder the visitor to the Acropolis and has imposed a certain order which will be found most useful.

He attempts to assign many of the more important statues and monuments mentioned by ancient writers to specific sites represented only by cuttings for foundation stones, and in this, of course, he rightly refuses to claim more than tentative results. In his discussion of the statues in the east portico of the Propylaea appear the difficulties and dangers of this phase of his work. We are not required to accept categorically the ultimate conclusions to which he arrives, but we may cheerfully receive the tentative restoration simply because it gives an impression of the original scene which in all probability closely approximates the truth. Where there is fairly strong reason for assigning a monument to a position, as is the case in the west portico, Mr. Stevens indicates the fact, but elsewhere he contents himself with tentative conclusions.

The outstanding part of his study is the restoration of the buildings connected with the sanctuary of Artemis Brauronia and the propylon with the court in front of the west façade of the Parthenon. Here we may be particularly grateful to Mr. Stevens for clarifying the evidence and for restoring a scene which has, until now, been quite lost. In such work he is adept, and his restorations based on careful study of the remains and on long experience accord with every probability and are most welcome.

It must be confessed that one feels quite strongly the paucity of references to earlier literature on the various subjects touched upon in the study.



Again, many may feel that the reasoning in the article is often obscure and difficult and that the unity of the work is disturbed by the adoption of several different modes of presentation. Occasionally (as on pp. 62 f.), flaws occur in the argument but usually without seriously affecting the result.

Turning to other problems raised by the work, the reviewer finds it hard to agree with the view expressed at the outset of the book on the groupings of buildings in ancient Greek sanctuaries and elsewhere. In all fairness one ought to have seen a site like Delphi or Olympia in the period of its high development before describing it so harshly as "a mess." A plan of one of these sites is inextricably confused, without doubt, but it must be remembered that most plans attempt to represent all remains of all periods at once. In many cases a plan of buildings existing at any given time is much less complex and more reasonable. The point cannot be argued further here, but it will bear consideration.

What seems to the reviewer a very important question centers about the retaining wall around the Old Athena Temple, behind the Promachos group (pp. 59 f.; in this connection the student may find Holland's "Erechtheum Papers," *AJA* [1924], of some interest). He dates the wall in the Mycenaean period, apparently for the sole reason that the area covered by the earth retained by the wall has no rock cuttings and hence was never uncovered during classical times. But its significance in the Mycenaean scheme is not really clear, and the absence of rock cuttings could be as easily understood if the wall were no earlier than the Old Athena Temple. Before that time there could scarcely have been many structures requiring rock-cut foundations and they may well have been elsewhere.

But it is from a review of such problems raised by his work that we see the value of Mr. Stevens' study; they imply no criticism. The important fact is that at last there is a reasoned exposition of a great number of long-unnoticed and seemingly insignificant but extremely interesting remains.

ROBERT SCRANTON

*University of Chicago*

---

*L'Egypte des astrologues.* By FRANZ CUMONT. Brussels: Fondation Egyptologique Reine Elisabeth (Vromant & Co.), 1937. Pp. 254.

In this book the author's purpose is to place at the disposal of Egyptologists and papyrologists information about the social and moral state of Hellenistic Egypt as shown in the astrological writings. For purposes of comparison, information on these subjects given by the papyri is added by Mlle Claire Preaux. The text forms largely a running commentary on the full citations from astrological works given in the notes. This material in the notes is a mine of useful information.

Cumont takes as his point of departure the astrological manuscript pub-



lished recently by Gundel,<sup>1</sup> though he utilizes freely the works of Manilius, Vettius Valens, and Firmicus Maternus as well.

One might read this significant work and overlook its importance if he were interested only in acquiring specific information on definite subjects. The basic importance of the book lies in the fact that Cumont has studied these works and catalogued the information they contain with a definite interest and a definite purpose in mind. He is interested in these ideas as they reflect the milieu, the state of society, and the intellectual atmosphere in which the ideas themselves developed.

Cumont contends that the authors of these astrological works were hellenized Egyptian scribes, in most cases, members of the priesthood. Hence their point of view differs radically from that found in the Greek writing and in the papyri. For instance, the astrological writers know little about the Greek concept of the *πόλις*, and there is little information in their works on the institutions and life of Alexandria as a Greek city. But these writers know a great deal about temple routine and temple organization. They are familiar with all the basic arts and crafts, laborers, guilds, and factories.

The fundamental importance of this material is that it gives us a glimpse of life in Egypt from a new point of view. No longer do we look at Ptolemaic Egypt from Alexandria as a member of a dominant class would see it, but we see it from the inside. Moreover, the inside we see is not a hellenized colony like the Fayum, but it is the old, unchanging life of the native temple.

The information on government and society, religion and morals, that we get from the astrological works is in entire agreement with what we learn on these subjects from the papyri. The writers of these works, however, add new and significant bits of information and, at the same time, contribute a fresh point of view.

To mention only a few matters treated so ably here, there is an interesting note on the *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς* on page 70, and an excellent discussion of the *κάτοχοι* on page 148.

An appendix deals with some allusions in the work of Firmicus Maternus. There is an index of Greek words, one of Latin words, and a short list of corrections.

THOMAS A. BRADY

University of Missouri

---

*Studies in the Text History of the Life and Fables of Aesop.* By B. E. PERRY. ("Monographs of the American Philological Association," No. 7.) Lancaster, Pa.: Lancaster Press, 1936. Pp. ix+240 with 6 plates.

It is not often possible to revise the whole tradition of a Greek text on the basis of a manuscript in an American collection. Professor Perry has done this

<sup>1</sup> Harleianus 3731. See Wilhelm Gundel, *Neue astrologische Texte des Hermes Trismegistos* ("Abh. Bay. Akad." [N.F.], Vol. XII [Munich, 1936]).

for the Aesopic tradition by careful interpretation of the material on the life and fables of Aesop contained in a tenth-century manuscript (No. 397) in the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York.

His work falls into two parts: an evaluation of the Morgan manuscript in the Vita tradition and a rehandling of the whole fable tradition in the light of the information thus gained. On pages 1-24 of the first part he compares the contents of the Vita of the Morgan manuscript (G) with the Byzantine version (*W* = the current text of Westermann) to show the broader scope and greater antiquity of the former. With painstaking detail he demonstrates G's greater vividness and fuller details which often throw light on matters which the condensed paraphrasing of *W* has obscured. By skilful manipulation of hints and allusions in the context he has also reconstructed the contents of two large lacunae in G, caused by the loss of a page, one after 36<sup>v</sup> and the other after 49<sup>v</sup>, showing in the former case that G supplied the motivation for otherwise pointless incidents in *W*, and in the latter that G once had a Rabelaisian anecdote lost probably by expurgation both to G and also to *W* except in the outlying branches of its tradition.

All this proves, of course, that G's version, being the richer, is likewise the older, at least in those details which are in some demonstrable degree common to the two versions. Where, however, detachable matter is found in G, of which no trace exists in *W*, this reviewer doubts whether it should necessarily be considered as ancient material neglected by *W*. Inasmuch as this is folk literature, comparable to the Alexander legend, we have to deal not with the mechanical laws of progressive deterioration, which in general control the transmission of standardized texts, but with living and changing materials, whole units of which may crop up or die away at any stage of the history of the text. So, for example, with the passage peculiar to G which is quoted on page 13. This "elaborate *ecphrasis* in the style of the bucolic poets" is considered by Professor Perry to be "probably as old as the context in which it stands." Yet in its general style and its stereotyped details it seems to the reviewer most suspiciously like the products of the late sophistic era of the fourth and fifth century of our era. Compare, e.g., the following details with the "Declamationes" of Choricius (Mai, *Spicilegium Romanum*, V, 413 and 447). Vita G—ταῖς βοτάναις προσκλίνας, Chor.—ἐπὶ πόρῃ τινὶ μαλθακῇ κατακλίνεται; Vita G—μαλθακοῦ πνεύματος, Chor.—πνεῦμα μέτριον (cf. Plato *Phaedr.* 229a, b); Vita G—ποικίλων ὀρνέων . . . ἔχει τὸ θρόλλημα, Chor.—ἦδον ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ὀρνίθες μουσικοί; Vita G—παμποικίλον ἄνθος ἐπηύξανε, Chor.—χρώμασι τῶν ἀνθῶν ποικιλλόμενος. If, as seems likely, this passage is a fourth-century addition, why may not other and less rhetorical *flosculi* have become attached to G after the establishment of the *W* version?

In the remainder of Part I (pp. 25-70) Professor Perry attempts to date the origins of the G and *W* recensions and compares them with the extant papyri. Although certainty is impossible, he sets the second century A.D. as the most likely period of origin for G, since its noticeable emphasis on Isis worship is

most natural to that time. For *W*, the eleventh century, with a possible localizing in eastern Asia Minor, is suggested. A detailed collation of the four papyrus fragments with the corresponding portions of the texts of *G* and *W* shows *G* is much closer to these independent witnesses than *W*, although here again evidence of the fluid state of this sort of tradition may be seen in the fact that the oldest piece (Berl. 11628, s. II vel III) omits details found in both *G* and *W*, and a younger fragment (Ox. 2083, s. IV vel V) adds a trifle which neither *G* nor *W* possesses.

Part II, "Studies in the Text History of the Fables," is a highly complicated discussion of an intricate problem, the details of which can hardly be touched upon in a brief review. Starting with the classification by Fedde, Hausrath, and Chambry of the Aesopic manuscripts into Class I, the Augustana group, headed by Monac. 564, which is recognized as the oldest and best tradition, Class II, headed by Vind. hist. gr. 130, which takes its prose fables from Class I and its verse fables from the Bodleian paraphrase of Babrius, and Class III, the Accursiana, which is a Byzantine collection derived in part from Classes I and II and in part from the Bodleian paraphrase and elsewhere, Professor Perry shows the position of *G* in this scheme and modifies to a marked degree several details of the classification.

Pages 77-145 contain a description of *G*'s fable content and a minute collation of both the order of the fables and their internal readings with the manuscripts of the Augustana group. The results (pp. 146-56) show that *G* is remarkably close in both respects to Monac. 564 (Chambry's Pb) and only slightly less so to Parisinus suppl. 690 (Chambry's favorite MS Pa). Moreover, because of its age and completeness (except for the loss of three leaves) *G* should take precedence as the best manuscript of the Augustana group.

On pages 156-73 Professor Perry successfully demolishes the theory of Hausrath and Marc that the Augustana recension was essentially a collection of rhetorical exercises in the schools, to which the highly rhetorical "Aphthonian preface" was appropriately prefixed in place of the Vita. Instead, he shows most ingeniously that in Pa, the most important manuscript chosen by Marc to prove his case, there are clear traces of the fact that the scribe had before him the Vita of *G* which, partly through error, he discarded in favor of the Aphthonian preface.

Thus Perry vindicates his most fruitful principle, which may be roughly stated in the form of a proportion.

*G* Fables: Augustana Fables: :*G* Vita: [Augustana Vita (= *G*) replaced by] Aphthonian Preface.

Continuing this illuminating parallelism (pp. 174-203), Professor Perry demonstrates that Chambry's Class II (or C) can best be connected with Class I in the light of the tradition of the Westermann Vita. In a previous study he had proved that *W* rested on two main groups of manuscripts, MOR and SBP, and that SBP came from an imperfect copy of MOR. Now, since the *W* Vita is a characteristic of Class II, and since M (Monac. 525)

is the best representative of MOR, it was reasonable to expect that the fable content of M would show up well in the Class II tradition. Such indeed is proved to be the case. In the prose fables M appears as the best representative of Class II and at the same time the connecting link with Class I, many of whose readings it alone retains. Thus again Professor Perry has brought to light a new and impressive authority. Chambry's C or Class II proper is now represented by M, while the previously used "C" manuscripts, partly by comparison with SBP of the Vita, are relegated to subordinate groupings IIa, IIb, and IIc.

The last section (pp. 204-28), dealing with Group III, the so-called Accursiana recension, really lies outside the main line of argument and is devoted to an ingenious attempt at proving that this version is not only late Byzantine but actually comes as a whole from the pen of Maximus Planudes, whose name is attached to the Vita in certain manuscripts. Herein Professor Perry seeks to overthrow Chambry's idea that the Accursiana is an ancient edition, possibly as early as the third century, and to maintain against Marc the solidarity of the recension.

The minuteness of Professor Perry's documentation and the closeness of his reasoning make this work difficult to summarize, yet his methods inspire confidence and his results are logical and important. We may look forward with eagerness to the full text edition of the life and fables which he promises us.

WARREN E. BLAKE

*University of Michigan*

---

*The Mediterranean World in Ancient Times.* By EVA MATTHEWS SANFORD. New York: Ronald Press, 1938. Pp. xxi + 596. \$4.50.

This is not just another of the numerous one-volume outlines of ancient history, for it is distinctive in aim and, to some degree, in accomplishment. The central purpose of the author, as stated in the Preface, is "to present the Ancient Mediterranean World as a whole," discarding "the time-honored division of Ancient History into three compartments in favor of a more unified plan."

This aim, to present a unified picture of Mediterranean civilization, is a laudable one, but its accomplishment is fortunately not necessarily conditioned upon blending the history of the Orient, Greece, and Rome into one narrative. This is almost impossible to carry through effectively, especially in a brief one-volume account such as this text. Real unity is to be gained primarily not by any special chronological arrangement but by interpretation and by constant emphasis upon the interrelation of peoples and cultures. In this the author has been fairly successful, regardless of her arrangement of chapters.

On the other hand, her attempt to present the history of the Near and

Farther East, Greece, and Rome "as a whole" in so compressed an account has led to some unfortunate results. The distinctions between different cultures and between the same culture in different periods of its history are too often blurred. Some of the chapters lack logical organization and sequence, and the narrative sometimes gives the impression of disconnectedness.

Especially unfortunate is the separation of all the earlier Roman history from the account of the late Republic and Empire. The impression of the unity of Roman history and of the essential relation between the earlier and later history is thereby lost. One phase of the history of a period is also entirely separated from another phase. For example, Rome's conquest of Italy is narrated in an entirely different connection from the development of the Roman constitution in the same period, though the two have a very intimate relation to each other. Such examples are common, especially in the cultural history. As a result, the book fails to meet one of the chief demands of the newer historiography—to present an integrated picture of all phases of the civilization of each period under consideration. One of the best chapters is chapter xxiii on the "Social Question in the Hellenistic Age," but the inclusion of the reforms of the Gracchi only confuses two quite different conditions in the mind of the student and makes it impossible to interpret the Gracchan movement in the light of its Roman background.

The frequent lack of logical organization also arises from an attempt to cover too vast a field—from prehistoric times to the eighth century A.D.—in the space of 575 pages. Some of the chapters, therefore, present a strange miscellany of all kinds of subjects.

The treatment of the cultural phases of the history is far too sketchy and is not sufficiently integrated with the other phases. Less than five pages are devoted to Greek literature and only six to Latin. Only nine pages are given to Greek and Roman architecture, and the numerous religions of the whole Mediterranean world, including Christianity, are disposed of in fourteen pages. The latter is given less than six pages; Jesus and Paul receive only passing mention, and neither is honored with a place in the Index. Only about two pages are devoted to the development of Roman law and its influence. The contributions of each oriental culture to the whole Mediterranean complex, of Greece to Rome, and of Rome to Western civilization are also insufficiently emphasized or analyzed. The book is to be highly commended, however, for its inclusion of the more recent archeological data from Asia Minor and the Farther East, its clear analysis of the migrations of peoples, and its emphasis upon the history of Parthia, Iran, and the Far East in relation to the Mediterranean lands.

Attractive and valuable supplements to the narrative are the numerous excellent and well-chosen illustrations and the eleven maps prepared especially for this history. Some of these are unusual in a text, for example, Map I of "Early Peoples and Culture Areas," and Map X, of the "Parthian Empire and Eastern Trade." Other aids are a well-analyzed chronology and an ade-

quate index. Unfortunately, references to or evaluations of the written sources are almost entirely omitted. The few well-chosen quotations from ancient authors might also have been multiplied to advantage.

The style, while clear, is somewhat dry and lacking in sparkle and vividness. This is doubtless owing to the attempt to recount the ancient history of the whole Mediterranean world to the eighth century A.D., including an exceptional emphasis on its relations to the central and Far East, in so limited a compass.

On the whole, however, the text reflects credit on the author and editors for its sound, up-to-date scholarship, its balanced interpretations, its remarkable freedom from errors of fact or printing, and its freshness and independence of approach.

A. A. TREVER

Lawrence College  
Appleton, Wisconsin

---

*Griechische Wirtschaftsrechnungen und Verwandtes (Papyri Iondanae, Fasc. VIII).* By JOHANN HUMMEL. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1938. Rm. 4.

This fascicle of P. Iand. is a doctoral thesis and contains ten documents dealing with economic matters ranging from Ptolemaic to Byzantine times. Most of them are fragmentary and, judging from the three plates which are included, far from easy to decipher. No. 146 is Ptolemaic, probably second century, and is the account kept by an illiterate steward of an estate. Unfortunately, not many prices are preserved: a loaf of bread cost 10 dr., a goose 1,000 dr., and a chlamys at least 3,000 dr. (all in copper). An entry in Col. XI, *εἰς λουτρὰ κιθῶνος ἀργυρίου* η γ Γ σι καὶ τόκου, is interpreted as the cost of washing a tunic, but the price is absurdly high, and the entry for interest is meaningless. Probably *λουτρὰ* should be read as *λύτρα*, and the entry may be regarded as a charge for ransoming the garment left in pawn with interest. The equation of copper to silver, if the readings are correct, gives a ratio of approximately 385:1. In Col. VI, I question the reading *εἰς τι(μὴν) τελ(ών)* [π]ερί [ἀ]χύριον, but the reproduction of this column is not sufficiently clear to suggest an alternative. No. 148 is an account of distribution of bread to workmen. Since none was given out on a holiday, the distribution was evidently made to hired labor who received a loaf of bread daily in addition to their wage. No. 151 is the best-preserved document in the collection and is a record of shipments by water kept by a dealer in textiles and other commodities. Probably dated correctly in the third century after Christ, the record covers shipments for a period extending over at least eight months. It may be noted that a tax was levied on a shipment of nuts(?) and a lodix valued at 548 dr. while the flax and linen were exempt. If the document is later than Aurelian, the exemption of flax and linen from taxation may be due to government monopoly. If so, this document will reward further study. The reading of the entries on the right, below line 20, seems to be (*γίνεται*) τὸ πα(ν) [ς] ψκη, or a



summary of the entries in lines 18-20. If so, the beginning of line 21 is lost in the lacuna at the end of line 20. No. 153 contains an interesting record of wine distributed to various people on order of the master. Besides the birthday celebrations, distributions are made to linen-weavers, dealers in hemp, rug- and tapestry-makers, guards, officials, villagers, and others. The account evidently comes from a large estate of the fourth century and reveals the manifold interests of the owner. No. 154 is important for the list of church officials who are entitled to distributions of wine. The other documents are quite fragmentary and offer little of economic interest. Under the guidance of Professor Kalbfleisch, Dr. Hummel has edited these documents in a competent manner, and the commentary leaves little to be desired.

ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON

Princeton

---

*Florilegium Gallicum: Untersuchungen und Texte zur Geschichte der mittel-lateinischen Florilegienliteratur.* By ANDERS GAGNÉR. ("Publications of the New Society of Letters at Lund," No. 18.) Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1936. Pp. 248 with 2 plates. Kr. 10.

The importance of the medieval florilegia in the spread of classical culture is a subject that is just beginning to be investigated. None of the manuscripts containing the longer anthologies has as yet been completely studied. To the individual authors collated and published by Ullman<sup>1</sup> Gagnér now adds the selections from Terence, the *Querolus*, and the *Timaeus*, as found in the five major florilegia. Also included in his apparatus are excerpts from these works which occur in a medieval treatise called *Moralium dogma philosophorum*, probably written by William of Conches in the early twelfth century. If this date is correct, the *Moralium dogma* antedates the earliest of these florilegia. Gagnér believes that its author used a florilegium of the same type as *n* (Paris 17903), and that a study of the similarities and differences in the citations of *n* and *M* can throw light upon the common archetype of the florilegia. Since it seems clear that these anthologies originated in France, this archetype is designated as *G* (*Florilegium Gallicum*).

Unfortunately for Gagnér's theory, a study of the excerpts from Horace and Juvenal which he cites shows that the differences between the texts of *n* and *M* are no less striking than the similarities. That there is often a resemblance between the titles in *n* and the language of the commentary in *M* is true. But, since *M* and *n* each contain selections not found in the other, and since *M* frequently agrees with the readings of the complete manuscripts instead of with the florilegia, his conclusion concerning a common archetype appears to be unjustified. Furthermore, Gagnér's evidence for a date as early as the ninth century for *G* is too tenuous to be accepted. To postulate an insular

<sup>1</sup> *Class. Phil.*, XXIII (1928), 128-74; XXIV (1929), 109-32; XXV (1930), 11-21; XXVI (1931), 128-54; XXVII (1932), 1-42.



archetype on the basis of confusion of abbreviation symbols for *et* and *in* is to put too much weight on that type of error. Nor is Gagnér's conclusion that *G* was used to correct the manuscript containing the commentary of Eugraphius on Terence substantiated by conclusive evidence.

Although Gagnér cites Ullman's articles for the purpose of criticizing some minor points, he fails to acknowledge use of some material which he unmistakably took from Ullman's publications in *Classical Philology* and in *Speculum* (VIII [1933], 312-36). At times the German is almost a word-for-word translation of the English, although no reference is made to Ullman's articles. The following example will illustrate:

Vincent made large use of a florilegium of the first type, arranged by authors, and even followed the same plan in many chapters of the *Speculum Historiale*. In the main, however, the material is classified [*Spec.*, VIII, 314].

Vincenz von Beauvais ist in vielen Kapiteln des *Speculum historiale* ein Vertreter des ersten Typus. Im grossen und ganzen sind jedoch die Excerpte bei ihm nach dem Inhalt geordnet und gehören also zum dritten Typ. Der Kompilator des Florilegium Gallicum dagegen hat seine Excerpte nach dem erstgenannten Typ angeordnet, also nach Autoren [Gagnér, p. 217].

Gagnér's "discovery" that Vincent of Beauvais made use of a florilegium of the type of *n* is presented in these words:

Aber das ist nicht alles. Das Florilegium *n*, das sich jetzt in der Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (Lat. 17903) befindet und das vorher eine lange Zeit der Notre-Dame Kirche in Paris gehörte, war nämlich in der Handschriftensammlung enthalten, die Claude Joly 1680 der Kirchenbibliothek schenkte. "Beaucoup lui étaient venus du célèbre avocat Antoine Loisel, son grand-père" bemerkt hierüber L. Delisle . . . und fährt er in der Fussnote 3 fort "Ont appartenu à Antoine Loisel les mss. latins. . . 17903 ..." Aber "Loisel avait recueilli plusieurs volumes très-précieux de la cathédrale de Beauvais!" [p. 59].

No reference is made to the following paragraph which Gagnér had before his eyes:

But that is not the end of the story. According to Delisle *n* was one of a group of manuscripts obtained by Claude Joly from his grandfather, Antoine Loisel, and presented to Notre Dame in 1680. This does not help much, but in the same footnote Delisle says: "Loisel avait recueilli plusieurs volumes très-précieux de la cathédrale de Beauvais" [*Class. Phil.*, XXIII (1928), 156].

Other passages that suggest that Gagnér made use of Ullman's researches without acknowledging his debt could also be quoted. For example, some material found on page 28 of Gagnér's book may be compared with the article in *Classical Philology* for 1932, page 40; page 118 of the Swedish publication, with pages 40-41; pages 195-96 with pages 26-28 of the same article. In the opinion of this reviewer Gagnér's sole contribution in this study has been the careful collation of material from three authors in the florilegia which had previously been unpublished.

DOROTHY M. ROBATHAN

Wellesley College

*Corpus vasorum antiquorum: The Robinson Collection, Baltimore, Md., Fasc. 2.*

By DAVID MOORE ROBINSON with the assistance of SARAH ELIZABETH FREEMAN. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937. Pp. 38 with 57 plates (6 in color).

This fascicule consists entirely of red-figure vases of the century 520-420 B.C. Several pieces do not belong to Professor Robinson, but to the Baltimore Society of the Archaeological Institute. There are many vases of first-rate importance; the skyphos with the signature of Polygnotos is the most sensational, but others deserve full attention. Many are already well known; but a kylix with the name Leagros, a pelike assigned to Myson, a hydria by Polygnotos (Eyebrows, not Lewis), a krater by the Kleophon Painter, and others of equal interest are new. Attributions are made cautiously and plausibly. Professor Robinson is almost too willing to adopt the views of others in preference to his own: thus the assignment to the Niobid Painter of the vase on Plate 36 is abandoned, apparently in deference to Webster, though Webster's discussion is notable chiefly for the principle that study of a painter must be founded on the vase from which the painter is named. The text is much fuller than usual in the *Corpus*, and the authors' erudition and wide acquaintance with the literature is constantly evident. The illustrations are excellent; glare is almost entirely overcome and in many cases details can be studied as fully as on the vase itself. Few fascicules of the *Corpus* are so satisfying.

F. P. JOHNSON

*University of Chicago*

*Die Victorverehrung im christlichen Altertum: Eine kultgeschichtliche und hagiographische Studie.* By FELIX RÜTTEN. ("Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums," Band XX, Heft 1.) Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1936. Pp. 182.

This is a study of the cultus of early Christian martyrs who carry the name Victor, and also such nearly related names as Corona, Kallinikos, and Stephanos. The name Victor is a very common one. It occurs seventy-four times in the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* (ca. 600), in which only the names Felix and Saturninus are more frequent. Yet not one of these SS. Victor is a clearly defined personality. Dr. Rütten's researches have led him to conclude that very few are historical persons with this name, yet, on the other hand, there is no evidence that any one of them is a purely fictitious character. In some instances a local Victor-cult goes back to the translation of relics of a martyr named Victor. But in most cases he believes the name Victor to have been originally a title of honor given a Christian martyr. In the course of time this honorific name developed into a distinct personal name and either superseded or remained as a secondary figure to some historical martyr.

Often the name was given to one whose real name was unknown. This was

frequently the case where a pagan festival was supplanted by the cult of a Christian Victor. Since the early Christians looked upon pagan gods as demons and martyrdom as a victory over the devil, this transfer was an easy one. Yet a major difficulty with the author's thesis is that in well-nigh every Victor-cult examined his conclusions are based upon inferences and hypotheses rather than upon factual evidence. His results therefore are plausible conjectures instead of convincing solutions. For example, a lection in the Braga Breviary for April 12 tells of a Christian named Victor who was martyred by a pagan mob at the time of a festival in one of their temples. Later a church in his honor was erected on the supposed site of the martyrdom. Rütten considers this to have been a Christian substitution for the festival of Jupiter Victor on April 13, on the grounds that there is much evidence that in Galicia many old local cults are known to have taken on *interpretatio Romana*, especially with the name of Jupiter. Or to take another example, the famous Victor-cult at Milan (which has a strong case for its historical basis) is observed on May 14, though the martyrdom is reported to have occurred on May 8. According to the Milan Calendar, the later date was the day of the translation of St. Victor to the Church of St. Victoris ad corpus. Rütten, however, believes that the real reason back of the change to May 14 was the desire to supplant a *dies natalis* of the Temple of Mars invictus in Rome. Mars was the most popular god of the Roman army after the middle of the third century. The *Passio* of the Christian Victor relates that he was a soldier under Maximian, whose residence was at Milan!

Most problematic is the attempt to connect the Victor-cults closely with the imperial household after Constantine. It is true that the first Christian emperor changed the imperial title *invictus* (introduced by Commodus and associated with Mithraism) to *victor*. It is also true that there were nine different and independent Victor-cults in the Rhine-Rhone-Po valleys, extending from Trier to Ravenna; and that one of them—that at Milan—dates back at least to the period of Ambrose when the imperial residence was at Milan. Yet there is absolutely no evidence for the author's opinion that these Christian Victors were patron saints of the emperor's household and protectors of the frontiers. Nor is there the slightest evidence that Constantine and his successors favored the Victor-cults as an expression of the emperors' new championship of Christianity over heathen cults, just as the martyrs had championed the Christian cause in the days of persecution.

In the author's favor, however, let it be said that he has made an honest effort to make intelligible materials which otherwise would be of slight meaning and, hence, of slight value. The insufficient accounts and vague traditions which surround so much of hagiology make final solutions of problems well-nigh impossible. Dr. Rütten's investigations are suggestive to say the least; and his research shows thoroughness and care in tracking down all possible clues.

MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, JR.

University of Chicago

*Demosthenes: Against Meidias, Androtion, Aristocrates, Timocrates, Aristogeiton I and II.* With an English translation by J. H. VINCE. ("Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1935. Pp. vii+597.

Mr. J. H. Vince is already well and favorably known to readers of the Loeb Classical Library by his collaboration with Mr. C. A. Vince in the translation of Demosthenes' *De corona* and *De falsa legatione* (reviewed by me in *Class. Phil.*, January, 1928, p. 93). The Greek text of the present edition is mainly that of Dindorf's third edition (Leipzig, 1881). Where readings of S have been rejected by Dindorf, they are wisely restored here. Spelling and elision have been revised. The translation is entirely satisfactory.

The matter of the notes must be very perplexing to Loeb editors. In the present volume there are very few, and about half of these deal with textual problems. On page 567 note *a* reads: "The jury voted first on the question of guilty or not guilty, and secondly on the penalty, if guilty." On page 574 note *a*, referring to the *Metroön*, says: "Where copies of all Athenian laws were deposited for reference." These simple facts, it seems to me, would be known to any reader, who has sufficient interest in Greek antiquity to read pseudo-Demosthenes' *Against Aristogeiton*. On the other hand, if these simple matters need annotation, how can *Against Meidias* be understood by the general reader with the help of scarcely more than two dozen notes? I object also to note *b* on page 171: "The little that is known of this law is derived from Aeschines' speech against Timarchus." Why not give the specific sections?

ALFRED P. DORJAHN

Northwestern University

*Occupations of the Lower Classes in Roman Society.* By MIMA MAXEY. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938. Pp. viii+98. \$1.50.

The framework within which this monograph is set is fixed in the Preface. It is "a study of Justinian's *Digest* undertaken to see what contribution it offers to our knowledge of the occupations of the humble man in the Roman world" (p. v), from which "those occupations that required the investment of capital, business, and commerce in all its phases have been excluded. . . . Professions, government service, and service in the army also have been excluded" (p. vi).

The study is largely lexicographical, in that it consists of an explanation of the occupational terms which occur in the *Digest*. These terms are treated under six heads: food, clothing, service for the household, transportation, agriculture, and specialized work outside the house. An introductory section gives a short outline of "the economic background."

In its organization the book departs, perhaps unwisely, from the traditional

division of slaves into *familia rustica* and *familia urbana*, a distinction carefully preserved by the *Digest* itself (e.g., l. xvi. 166 and vii. i. 15. 1).

The exclusion of business from the discussion was necessary if the book was to be kept within manageable limits, and the line drawn had to be arbitrary. It is often impossible to determine whether a skilled workman is directly serving his master or whether the work is being done for profit (e.g., *obstetrix*, ix. ii. 9. 1). Hence it was no doubt justifiable to exclude entertainers of all kinds (e.g., *comoedi* and *symphoniaci*, ix. ii. 22. 1; cf. vii. i. 15. 1).

Expansion of the Bibliography (pp. 97-98) to include word lists of the juristic writings would have been prudent. Among possible additions, the most important are: Heumann-Seckel, *Handlexikon zu den Quellen des römischen Rechts*<sup>9</sup> (Jena, 1926); Mayr, *Vocabularium Codicis Iustiniani* (Prague, 1923); and the completed parts of the *Vocabularium iurisprudentiae Romanae* (Berlin, 1903—). A conscientious check of these sources against the occupational terms in Dessau (*ILS*, III, Part 2, 726 ff.) and Marquardt-Mau (*Privatleben*<sup>2</sup>, pp. 137 ff.) would have widely increased not only the number of pertinent words (e.g., *textrix*, xv. i. 27; *vestiarius*, xiv. iii. 5; *librarius*, vii. i. 15. 1; *leguli* and *opifices*, vii. i. 13. 6; *arator*, xxxiii. vii. 18. 16) but also the number of references to words actually treated (e.g., *lanifica*, vii. viii. 12. 6; *ostiarius*, *ibid.* and xxxii. lxi; *politor*, cf. xix. ii. 9. 5; *operarius*, xlv. i. 137. 3; *textor*, xxxii. lxi; *fossor*, see also *fossa*, *fodere*; *putator*, xliii. xx. 1. 27; *aedificator*, cf. xi. viii. 1. 9; *lapidarius*, l. vi. 7; *balneator*, vii. i. 15. 1; *machinarius*, xi. vi. 7. 1; and *asinus machinarius*, xxxii. lx. 3).

Although it is incomplete in some respects, the study is of considerable value because of its uniqueness. It sharply focuses our attention on the mass of information on Roman private life which is to be found in the juristic writings, and in it a good beginning has been made toward the interpretation of this evidence in connection with one phase of the subject.

D. A. AMYX

University of Chicago

---

*The "Suppliant Women" of Euripides.* Edited by T. NICKLIN. New York: Oxford University Press, 1936. Pp. xii+120. \$1.25.

An attractive and inexpensive edition of the *Suppliant Women*, containing introductions and notes to Murray's Oxford text and apparently intended for a student reading his first Greek tragedy, interests all of us who teach introductory courses in this field. In the present volume we are likely to be disappointed; the good is mingled with much that is less satisfactory. In preface I should like to remark that some of the following criticisms are unfair inasmuch as they are based on practice in this country with which the editor was not primarily concerned and with which he may not be familiar, but the reasons for my adoption of this standpoint are obvious.

The notes are properly brief and are generally free from illustrative paral-

lels which are, for a student at this stage, more exasperating than helpful. Yet, unfortunately, when the editor cites a parallel, he does so often in passages demanding this type of comment less than some not so treated, and he usually draws his examples from the Greek of the New Testament. For syntax and accidence reference is not made to any grammar. Instead, the aim has been to explain each construction once and then to use cross-reference. In part this procedure involves no loss; English editors rarely refer to grammars in common use by students here. On the other hand, the editor's explanations are sometimes not sufficiently clear or detailed. But, granting the method, we find flaws in execution. In an effort to distribute the commentary, the notes on earlier passages often refer to comments on later sections. The student's just wrath at this technique will increase when in 64 he is referred to 61 whence the trail doubles back to 1142, or when in 59 he is sent to 1149 only to find no note at all and his information in 1148. Aside from these mechanical deficiencies, difficulties remain. Rightly, few assumptions are made of the student's knowledge of the syntax of the cases, and even the "dative of advantage" is explained. Yet in the modal usage of the verb the editor frequently assumes that the syntax is familiar. Even where some notice is taken, students raised on Goodwin will be puzzled by the use of "historic sequence" in regard to conditional relative clauses (210, 864) as well as by the note on a conditional temporal clause in 948 or by the lack of note in 897. Remarks made at 521 on the future indicative in protases receive needed reinforcement at 711; then the future in 783 slips past as apparently in the same class. In 1066 the student is warned that he must distinguish this construction from that of 1069, but when he reaches 1069 no help is forthcoming.

One of the strong points of the book is its treatment of certain idioms only too frequently neglected. As for the particles, though *γάρ* receives fair treatment, others appear as "in good sooth" (423) or "and yet again verily" (442). Through rearrangement of order and through translation the student probably receives sufficient aid. Although slight attention is paid to the metrical and dramatic elements of the play, the neglect is perhaps not vital since many of us prefer to teach these points ourselves.

Some statements are rather surprising. Euripides died torn to pieces by Archelaus' dogs (p. iv). The chorus' lament over its vain childbearing, *ἐφερον ὅφ' ἦπατος* (919), calls forth: "The custom of animal sacrifice made the ancients more familiar with anatomical facts than we are." The note on 176 is particularly unfortunate. To say that Aristophanes *had* ridiculed Euripides in the *Frogs* and that this passage is the poet's reply is a chronological impossibility. The difficulty can be removed by reading "in the *Acharnians*" which is the better reference in any case. Be that as it may, to continue the note, "but at the same time represented Agathon" involves the same impossibility as well as implying that Agathon appeared in the *Frogs*.

HAROLD B. DUNKEL

University of Chicago



*Tacitus: Selections from His Works.* Edited with Introduction and Notes by FRANK BURR MARSH and HARRY J. LEON. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1936. Pp. xii+546. \$2.25

This is an excellent edition. The selections from the *Annals*, ample and well chosen, treat mainly of the persons of Tiberius and Nero; the *Agricola* appears in its entirety, and of the *Germania* the first half is offered. The interpretation of the historian in the Introduction and Notes (more than three hundred pages) displays the same sound scholarship and critical acumen that Professor Marsh revealed in his *The Reign of Tiberius*. Considerable help is given by the commentators in matters of syntax and of comprehension, too. A special feature of the well-edited book are the illustrations of imperial characters. In the case of so difficult an author as Tacitus, however, the present-day student will surely lament the omission of a vocabulary.

EDGAR C. REINKE

*Alabama State College for Women*

---

*Bulletin des sommaires et comptes rendus bibliographiques des périodiques français et étrangers.* Centre International de Documentation Classique, 14 Rue Paul Déroulède, Bois-Colombes, Seine. \$4.00 a year (cheques barrés de banque ou cheques postaux [c/c 900/45 Paris] au nom de R. Toussaint).

The bulletin listed here is an example of the manner in which France is rapidly taking the lead in supplying bibliographical aids to the students of classics and ancient culture. In small pamphlets appearing every fourteen days are listed not only titles of articles but also book reviews for the fields of ancient (including prehistory) and medieval studies. The periodicals surveyed number over four hundred. In addition to supplying the bulletin, the organization also has a loan service allowing subscribers to borrow periodicals and retain them for four days. This service will be more convenient for European and particularly French scholars than for Americans, though, we are told, loans can be made and already have been made to Americans. Publishers of periodicals naturally will hope that nothing will come of the suggestion that subscribers to the *Bulletin des sommaires* can reduce the number of their subscriptions to other periodicals, though there is some consolation in the statement that its publication has caused an increase in subscriptions on the part of universities and libraries. Finally, the organization also is willing to answer inquiries concerning the literature that has appeared in recent years (1937 and later) on any specific subject.

J. A. O. LARSEN

*University of Chicago*



## BOOKS RECEIVED

- BARWICK, KARL. *Caesars Commentarii und das Corpus Caesarianum*. (Philologus, Supplementband XXXI, Heft 2.) Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1938. Pp. vi+222. Rm. 15.
- BASSETT, SAMUEL ELIOT. *The Poetry of Homer*. ("Sather Classical Lectures," Vol. XV.) Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1938. Pp. v+273. \$2.50.
- BERNARD, J. E., JR. *The Prosody of the Tudor Interlude*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1939. Pp. xi+227. \$3.00.
- BIEBER, MARGARETE. *The History of the Greek and Roman Theater*. Princeton: Princeton University Press; London: Humphrey Milford; The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1939. Pp. ix+465. \$7.50.
- BLAKE, WARREN E. (trans.). *Chariton's Chaereas and Callirhoe*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. vii+125. \$2.00.
- BLOMGREN, S. *Siliana: De Silii Italici Punicis quaestiones criticae et interpretationes*. ("Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift," 1938:7.) Uppsala: A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1938. Pp. vii+76. Kr. 2.50.
- BOURBERES, KONST. I. ΚΡΑΤΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΙΔΕΙΑ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟΝ ΠΛΑΤΩΝΑ. Athens, 1939. Pp. 31.
- BOX, HERBERT (ed. and trans.). *Philonis Alexandrini "In Flaccum."* Edited with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary. London, New York, and Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. lxii+129. \$4.50.
- BUTTNER, BROTHER CHARLES HENRY (ed.). *Hugonis de Sancto Victore Didascalicon de studio legendi: A Critical Text*. ("Catholic University of America Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin," Vol. X.) Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1939. Pp. lii+160. \$2.00.
- The Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. XII: *The Imperial Crisis and Recovery, A.D. 193-324*. Edited by S. A. COOK, F. E. ADcock, M. P. CHARLESWORTH, and N. H. BAYNES. Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co., 1939. Pp. xxvii+849+10 maps. \$10.
- The Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. V: *Plates. Prepared by C. T. SELTMAN*. Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co., 1939. Pp. xv+243. \$4.00.
- DAY, ARCHIBALD A. *The Origins of Latin Love-Elegy*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1938. Pp. 148. 7s. 6d.
- EARP, CRONJE BURNFORD. *A Study of the Fragments of Three Related Plays of Accius*. (Dissertation, Columbia University.) Pp. ix+106.
- ENNIS, SISTER MARY GRATIA. *The Vocabulary of the Institutiones of Cassiodorus with Special Adherence to the Technical Terminology and Its Sources*. ("Catholic University of America Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin," Vol. IX.) Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1939. Pp. xvi+171.

- FIELDS, DONALD EUGENE. *The Technique of Exposition in Roman Comedy*. (Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1935.) Chicago: University of Chicago Libraries, 1938. Pp. iii+200.
- HARLEMAN, EINAR. *De Claudiano Mamerto Gallicae Latinitatis scriptore quaestiones*. Uppsala: A. B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1938. Pp. ix+103.
- HEICHELHEIM, FRITZ M. *Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Altertums vom Paläolithikum bis zur Völkerwanderung der Germanen, Slaven und Araber*. 2 vols. Leiden: A. W. Sijthoff's Uitgeversmaatschappij N.V., 1938. Pp. xiii+859; 860-1239. Unbound, fl. 49; bound, fl. 52.
- JERNIGAN, CHARLTON C. *Incongruity in Aristophanes*. (Dissertation, Duke University.) Menasha, Wis.: George Banta Publishing Co., 1939. Pp. 48.
- JONKERS, ENGBERT JAN. *Invloed van het Christendom op de romeinse wetgeving betreffende het concubinaat en de echtscheiding*. Wageningen: H. Veenman & Zonen, 1938. Pp. 224.
- LAZZATI, GIUSEPPE. *Introduzione allo studio di Clemente Alessandrino*. ("Pubblicazioni dell' Università Cattolica del S. Cuore," Ser. IV, Vol. XXXII.) Milano: Società Editrice "Vita e Pensiero," 1939. Pp. viii+92. L. 15.
- MADDALENA, ANTONIO. *L'Aria di Anassimene come sintesi*. (Reprinted from *Atti del Reale Istituto Veneto di Scienze Lettere ed Arti*, XCVII, Part II [1937-38], 515-45.)
- MERRITT, BENJAMIN DEAN; WADE-GERY, H. T.; and MCGREGOR, MALCOLM FRANCIS. *The Athenian Tribute Lists*, Vol. I. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1939. Pp. xxxii+605+25 plates.
- MUGLER, CH. *L'Evolution des constructions participiales complexes en grec et en latin*. ("Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg," Fasc. 88.) Paris: Société d'Éditions "Les Belles Lettres," 1938. Pp. 172. Fr. 35.
- . *L'Evolution des subordonnées relatives complexes en grec*. ("Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg," Fasc. 89.) Paris: Société d'Éditions "Les Belles Lettres," 1938. Pp. 132. Fr. 25.
- OLZSCHA, KARL. *Interpretation der Agrar Mumienbinde*. (*Klio*, Beiheft XL.) Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1939. Pp. viii+217. Rm. 13.
- PEETERS, F. *Le Culte de Jupiter en Espagne d'après les inscriptions*. (Reprinted from: *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, XVII [1938], 157-93, 853-86.)
- PHILIPPSON, PAULA. *Griechische Gottheiten in ihren Landschaften*. ("Symbolae Osloenses," Fasc. supplet. IX.) Oslo: A. W. Brøgger, 1939. Pp. 83.
- Philological Quarterly*, Vol. XVIII, No. 1 (January, 1939). Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1939.
- POWELL, J. ENOCH. *The History of Herodotus*. ("Cambridge Classical Studies," Vol. IV.) Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co., 1939. Pp. viii+96.
- PRATT, NORMAN T., JR. *Dramatic Suspense in Seneca and in His Greek Precursors*. (Dissertation, Princeton University.) Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1939. Pp. 120. \$2.00.
- RADERMACHER, LUDWIG. *Mythos und Sage bei den Griechen*. Baden bei Wien and Leipzig: Rudolf M. Rohrer Verlag, 1938. Pp. 360. Geh., Rm. 9.50; Leinen, Rm. 12.

- RAPISARDA, E. (ed.). *Eschilo: "Il Prometeo legato."* ("Scrittori greci commentati per le scuole.") Torino: Società Editrice Internazionale, 1936. Pp. xxxix+225. L. 10.
- . *Teofilo di Antiochia.* Torino: Società Editrice Internazionale, 1937. Pp. cxxvi+155. L. 16.
- Revue des études homériques*, Vol. V (1935). Monaco, 1935. Fr. 30.
- RIPOSATI, BENEDETTO (ed.). *M. Terenti Varronis De vita populi Romani. Fonti—Esegesi—Edizione critica dei frammenti.* ("Pubblicazioni dell'Università Cattolica del S. Cuore," Ser. IV, Vol. XXXIII.) Milano: Società Editrice "Vita e Pensiero," 1939. Pp. ix+320. L. 30.
- RIZZO, G. ALFREDO (ed.). *Demostene: la seconda Olintiaca, con introduzione e commento.* Livorno: R. Giusti editore, 1938. Pp. xiv+95. L. 7.60.
- SALANITRO, NINUS. *Nugae criticae.* Neapoli: Apud Aloisium Loffredo, 1939. Pp. 21. L. 5.
- SCHLESINGER, KATHLEEN. *The Greek Aulos: A Study of Its Mechanism and of Its Relation to the Modal System of Ancient Greek Music, Followed by a Survey of the Harmonia in Survival or Rebirth in Folk Music.* London: Methuen & Co., 1939. Pp. 1+577. 2 guineas.
- SCHNABEL, PAUL. *Text und Karten des Ptolemäus.* ("Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte der Geographie und Völkerkunde," Band II.) Leipzig: K. F. Koehlers Antiquarium, 1938. Pp. viii+128+8 plates. Broschiert, Rm. 8; Leinwand, Rm. 10.
- SEVERYNS, A. *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus, Part I: Le Codex 239 de Photius, Tome I: Etude paléographique et critique; Tome II: Texte, traduction, commentaire.* ("Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège," Fasc. 78.) Liège: Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres; Paris: Librairie E. Droz, 1938. Pp. xvi+404+3 plates; 298. Fr. 200.
- SILVER, ISIDORE. *The Pindaric Odes of Ronsard.* Paris: Pierre André imprimeur, 1937. Pp. xv+143.
- SMITH, CHARLES EDWARD, and MOORHEAD, PAUL GRADY. *A Short History of the Ancient World.* ("Century Historical Series.") New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1939. Pp. xvii+653. \$3.75.
- TARN, W. W. *The Greeks in Bactria and India.* Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co., 1938. Pp. xxiii+539. \$8.00.
- WALDE, A., and HOFMANN, J. B. *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Band I: A-L. 3d rev. ed. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1938. Pp. xxxiv+872. Geh., Rm. 20.00; geb., 22.50.
- WALLACE, EDITH OWEN. *The Notes on Philosophy in the Commentary of Servius on the Eclogues, the Georgics, and the Aeneid of Vergil.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1938. Pp. 200.
- WESTINGTON, MARS McCLELLAND. *Atrocities in Roman Warfare to 133 B.C.* (Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1938.) Chicago: University of Chicago Libraries, 1938. Pp. iii+139. \$1.25.
- ZEISE, HANS. *Der Staatsmann: Ein Beitrag zur Interpretation des Platonischen Politikos.* (*Philologus*, Supplementband XXXI, Heft 3.) Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1938. Pp. viii+113. Rm. 7.

3. *in*  
 4. *in*  
 5. *in*  
 6. *in*  
 7. *in*  
 8. *in*  
 9. *in*  
 10. *in*  
 11. *in*  
 12. *in*  
 13. *in*  
 14. *in*  
 15. *in*  
 16. *in*  
 17. *in*  
 18. *in*  
 19. *in*  
 20. *in*  
 21. *in*  
 22. *in*  
 23. *in*  
 24. *in*  
 25. *in*  
 26. *in*  
 27. *in*  
 28. *in*  
 29. *in*  
 30. *in*  
 31. *in*  
 32. *in*  
 33. *in*  
 34. *in*  
 35. *in*  
 36. *in*  
 37. *in*  
 38. *in*  
 39. *in*  
 40. *in*  
 41. *in*  
 42. *in*  
 43. *in*  
 44. *in*  
 45. *in*  
 46. *in*  
 47. *in*  
 48. *in*  
 49. *in*  
 50. *in*  
 51. *in*  
 52. *in*  
 53. *in*  
 54. *in*  
 55. *in*  
 56. *in*  
 57. *in*  
 58. *in*  
 59. *in*  
 60. *in*  
 61. *in*  
 62. *in*  
 63. *in*  
 64. *in*  
 65. *in*  
 66. *in*  
 67. *in*  
 68. *in*  
 69. *in*  
 70. *in*  
 71. *in*  
 72. *in*  
 73. *in*  
 74. *in*  
 75. *in*  
 76. *in*  
 77. *in*  
 78. *in*  
 79. *in*  
 80. *in*  
 81. *in*  
 82. *in*  
 83. *in*  
 84. *in*  
 85. *in*  
 86. *in*  
 87. *in*  
 88. *in*  
 89. *in*  
 90. *in*  
 91. *in*  
 92. *in*  
 93. *in*  
 94. *in*  
 95. *in*  
 96. *in*  
 97. *in*  
 98. *in*  
 99. *in*  
 100. *in*